

JPRS-TAC-89-022

31 MAY 1989



FOREIGN
BROADCAST
INFORMATION
SERVICE

JPRS Report

Arms Control

Arms Control

JPRS-TAC-89-022

CONTENTS

31 MAY 1989

CHINA

China Said To Sell Long-Range Ballistic Missiles to Syria, Saudi Arabia	1
French Paper Cited on M9's, CSS-2's /Cairo MENA 18 May/	1
Saudi Defense Ministry Denies Story /Riyadh Radio 20 May/	1
'Roundup' Views U.S.-Soviet Contention in Europe /Wu Jin; XINHUA 16 May/	1
Nuclear Weapons No-First-Use Policy Defended /He Zuoxiu; ZIRAN BIANZHENGFA TONGXUN No 1, 10 Feb/	2

EAST ASIA

JAPAN

Foreign Minister Uno Comments on Soviet Troop Cut in Far East /KYODO 19 May/	7
Foreign Ministry Reaffirms Nonnuclear Principles /T. Johnson; KYODO 18 May/	7

THAILAND

Further on Controversy over Thai Workers at Libyan Chemical Plant	8
U.S. Pressure Criticized /NAEO NA 19 May/	8
Prime Minister, Libyan Envoy Discuss Issue /Bangkok Radio 18 May/	8
Stricter Screening Policy /SIAM RAT 20 May/	8
Thai Muslims Reproach U.S. /SIAM RAT 23 May/	9
U.S. Pledges Not To Attack Plant /THE NATION 24 May/	9

EAST EUROPE

INTRABLOC AFFAIRS

Warsaw Pact Force Limitation Proposal at CFE Talks	11
CSSR Representative Submits Proposal /Prague CTK 23 May/	11
Further Report /Bratislava PRAVDA 19 May/	11
Warsaw Pact Military Council Opens Berlin Session /East Berlin ADN 22 May/	11
Warsaw Pact Chief of Staff Writes on Asymmetry /I. Lutov; Warsaw ZOLNIERZ WOLNOSCI 26 Apr/	12

ALBANIA

NATO Missile Modernization Plans Deplored /G. Kondi; BASHKIMI 17 May/	14
---	----

CZECHOSLOVAKIA

CFE Limitations on Troop Numbers Urged /CTK 18 May/	14
1st Group of Soviet Tanks Leaves 23 May	15
Depart from Krupka Garrison /Prague Radio 23 May/	15
Tanks To Be 'Melted Down' /CTK 23 May/	15

GERMAN DEMOCRATIC REPUBLIC

Soviet Troops Continue Prenzlau Withdrawal	15
25th Tank Division Leaves /ADN 18 May/	15
Population Bids Farewell /ADN 18 May/	16
U.S. Request for CDE Inspection on GDR Territory Granted /ADN 18 May/	16

CSCE Members Observe Soviet-GDR Exercise	16
Gen Rumyantsev Comments [ADN 19 May]	16
Exercises Continue [NEUES DEUTSCHLAND 17 May]	17
Observers Depart [NEUES DEUTSCHLAND 20-21 May]	17
U.S. Reaction to Soviet Initiative Viewed [NEUES DEUTSCHLAND 19 May]	17

HUNGARY

Foreign Ministry Official on Soviet Proposals to Baker [B. Kupper; NEPSZABADSAG 13 May]	18
NATO's Woerner Interviewed on Military Doctrine [MTI 15 May]	19
Soviet Troop, Materiel Withdrawal Continues	19
Tank Unit Departs [Budapest Radio 19 May]	19
Soviet Armored Regiment Leaves [Budapest Radio 19 May]	20

POLAND

Jaruzelski Chairs Defense Committee Meeting on Defense Doctrine, CFE [PAP 21 May]	20
---	----

ROMANIA

Foreign Ministry Conveys Pact Appeal to NATO [AGERPRES 22 May]	20
Commentary Supports 'Denuclearization' of Europe [R. Caplescu; SCINTEIA 13 May]	21
Public Groups Appeal to NATO Counterparts on SNF	21
Appeals Delivered to Embassies [AGERPRES 22 May]	21
Trade Unions, Church Statements [AGERPRES 23 May]	22
More Appeals To Halt Plans [AGERPRES 23 May]	24
SCINTEIA Editorial Urges Halt to SNF Modernization [AGERPRES 24 May]	24

YUGOSLAVIA

Ambassador Pejic Assesses Role of UN Disarmament Commission [TANJUG 10 May]	25
---	----

LATIN AMERICA

BRAZIL

Prototype VLS Space Rocket Launched [Brasilia Radio 18 May]	26
Avibras, PRC To Sell Satellite Launchers [R. Lopes; FOLHA DE SAO PAULO 19 Apr]	26
PRC Negotiates Bid for Brasilsat-2 Launchers [R. Lopes, Chen Shouchun; FOLHA DE SAO PAULO 19 Apr]	28

NEAR EAST & SOUTH ASIA

INDIA

Reportage, Commentary on Agni IRBM Test Launch	31
Successful Launch Announced [Delhi Radio 22 May]	31
Further Report [Delhi Radio 22 May]	31
Gandhi Hails Missile Test [Delhi Radio 22 May]	31
Media Hail Launch, Criticize U.S. [AFP 23 May]	31
Public Hails Launch [Delhi Radio 23 May]	32
Commentary on Agni Launch [K.S. Jayaraman; Delhi Radio 23 May]	33

PAKISTAN

Agni IRBM Launch by India Reported [Islamabad Radio 22 May]	33
---	----

WEST EUROPE

FEDERAL REPUBLIC OF GERMANY

Issues of SNF Deterrence Value Analyzed [K. Kaiser; DIE ZEIT 5 May]	34
Kohl Appeals to Europeans on Short-Range Missile Question [DPA 19 May]	38

Defense Minister Stoltenberg Assesses SNF Talks With U.S. Officials	38
'Met with More Understanding' /Mainz TV 19 May]	38
Agreement Expected 'by Next Weekend' /DPA 21 May]	38
Differences With U.S. Noted /DPA 22 May]	38
SPD Drafts Concept for Missile Elimination /SUEDDEUTSCHE ZEITUNG 19 May]	39
Foreign Minister Genscher Expects Quick Conventional Arms Accords /DPA 20 May]	39
Bundestag President Suessmuth Stresses Bonn's Reliability in NATO /DIE WELT 19 May]	40
Foreign Minister Genscher Interviewed on 'European Peace Order' /M. Geist, S. Schelling; WELT AM SONNTAG 21 May]	40
SPD's Vogel, Bahr on Compromise With U.S. /DPA 22 May]	43
'Quarrel' With Washington on Missiles Continues /FRANKFURTER ALLGEMEINE 23 May]	43
CDU's Dregger Sees NATO 'Consensus' on SNF Reduction Still Possible /DPA 24 May]	44
Kohl Receives Further U.S. Message on Missiles /DPA 24 May]	44
FDP's Schaefer Supports Early Missile Talks /SUEDDEUTSCH ZEITUNG 24 May]	45
Gorbachev's 'Public Diplomacy' Seen as Impeding Negotiations /FRANKFURTER ALLGEMEINE 24 May]	45

FRANCE

President Mitterrand Discusses SNF, Nuclear Testing at Press Conference /Paris Radio 18 May] ..	46
---	----

SPAIN

Prime Minister Gonzalez Calls Gorbachev Offer on SNF 'Insufficient' /YA 14 May]	48
Prime Minister Gonzalez Discusses SNF with FRG's Kohl on Visit to Bonn	48
Preview of Talks /Hamburg DPA 22 May]	48
Kohl: 'Still in Process of Dialog' /Hamburg DPA 22 May]	49
Gonzalez: NATO Summit 'Great Opportunity' /Madrid Radio 22 May]	49

UNITED KINGDOM

Defense Secretary Accuses Pact on Chemical, Conventional Arms /J. Gooch; THE DAILY TELEGRAPH 18 May]	50
NATO, Pact Chiefs Exchange Views on Short-Range Missiles /C. Miller; PRESS ASSOCIATION 18 May]	50

China Said To Sell Long-Range Ballistic Missiles to Syria, Saudi Arabia

French Paper Cited on M9's, CSS-2's
NC1805182989 Cairo MENA in Arabic
1608 GMT 18 May 89

[Text] Paris, 18 May (MENA)—The French newspaper LA TRIBUNE [as received] reported today that Saudi Arabia and Syria have signed a three-way agreement with the PRC to purchase surface-to-surface M9 missiles and Chinese long-range [as received] CSS-2 ballistic missiles, which have a range of 2,700 km. These missiles are described as "self-guiding"—that is, they carry equipment that enables them to adjust their course by themselves.

The French newspaper, which specializes in economic affairs, adds that Saudi Arabia will finance the entire deal. The paper notes that Riyadh had previously supplied itself with Chinese-made CSS-2's, something which angered the United States at the time, according to the paper.

Saudi Defense Ministry Denies Story
LD2005210289 Riyadh Domestic Service in Arabic
2000 GMT 20 May 89

[Text] Today's issue of the Kuwaiti daily AL-SIYASAH quoted the German [as heard] LA TRIBUNE newspaper as saying that the Kingdom and Syria have signed a trilateral agreement with the PRC to purchase M-9 surface-to-surface missiles and other Chinese ballistic missiles. The story also said that the Kingdom will fund the entire deal.

A responsible source at the Defense Ministry told SPA that there is no truth whatsoever to this story.

'Roundup' Views U.S.-Soviet Contention in Europe
HK1905142189 Beijing XINHUA Hong Kong Service
in Chinese 0923 GMT 16 May 89

[“Roundup” by Wu Jin: “A ‘European Contention’ Is in the Ascendant”—XINHUA headline]

[Text] Washington, 15 May (XINHUA)—When NATO was engaged in an endless dispute over the question of short-range missiles, Moscow announced on 11 May that it would unilaterally reduce 500 short-range nuclear warheads. Undoubtedly, this was pouring oil on the fire. The United States reluctantly expressed a “welcome” on the one hand and played down the significance of the Soviet decision on the other by asserting that this amount only accounted for 5 to 10 percent of the short-range Soviet nuclear warheads. Therefore the United States pointed out that the decision was “militarily insignificant.” West Germany has always urged the

United States to hold talks with the Soviet Union on the reduction of short-range nuclear missiles in Europe. This time it openly described the Soviet decision as a “step in the right direction.”

Subsequently U.S. Secretary of State Baker, who had just concluded his visit to the Soviet Union, flew to Brussels on 12 May to meet West German Minister of Foreign Affairs Genscher. On the same day Soviet Minister of Foreign Affairs Shevardnadze met West German Chancellor Kohl in Bonn. At a news conference after their meeting, the Soviet Minister of Foreign Affairs asserted that if the United States insisted on updating its short-range nuclear missiles in West Germany, the Soviet Union would stop its destruction of SS-23 medium-range missiles as clarified by the 1987 U.S.-Soviet treaty on medium-range missiles or would manufacture a new type of short-range missiles to contend with the United States.

Instead of objecting to the remarks of the Soviet Minister of Foreign Affairs, West German officials pointed out that the Soviet stand was beneficial to West Germany's opposition to the U.S. renewing of its short-range missiles in West Germany and was also favorable to West Germany's demand for holding negotiations on reducing such missiles.

But U.S. public opinion was very worried about this development and pointed out that this would make it more difficult for the United States and West Germany to solve their disputes. Apart from this, the prospects for a NATO conference of heads of state that will take place in half a month will not necessarily be optimistic.

The U.S. stand on short-range missiles does not enjoy support from people in the country or abroad. Among its allies, only Britain insists on siding with the United States whereas most West European nations support West Germany. Domestically, as THE NEW YORK TIMES pointed out, “key figures from the conservatives, the moderates, and the liberals are tending toward a consensus on the question of holding negotiations on short-range missiles.”

Despite some NATO countries' mediation, the United States still maintains a hard-line attitude toward the West German proposal on holding negotiations on short-range missiles. Although West Germany has moderated its tone, it has not relaxed its stand on essential problems. West German public opinion has even made anti-American remarks that have not been heard over the last few years. (Adolf Augustine), chief editor of the German weekly DER SPIEGEL, wrote an article in the 8 May issue of the magazine pointing out in a sharp tone: “The stationing of U.S. troops in our territory is not a coincidence or aimed at helping the kindhearted Germans; it is absolutely for their own sake.” The article was published under the title: “Yankees, Go Home!”

Washington is more worried about Soviet leader Gorbachev's visit to Bonn that will take place subsequent to a NATO conference of heads of state. The United States fears that Gorbachev might make more attractive peace proposals by taking advantage of the West German people's strong demand for further relaxation and disarmament and that this might widen the gap between Bonn and Washington and affect NATO's unity.

Of course, the United States is not always passive on the question of contending for Europe. As a matter of fact, some U.S. high-ranking schemers have openly pointed out the possibility that the United States could take advantage of some difficulties in the Soviet Union and East European countries to "encourage" and "help" East European countries to practice "political diversification" and "economic liberalization." President Bush will visit Poland and Hungary soon obviously for this purpose.

Evidently, following the development of relaxation, the two superpowers will step up their efforts to cut the ground from under each other's feet.

Nuclear Weapons No-First-Use Policy Defended
40050426 Beijing ZIRAN BIANZHENGFA TONGXUN
[Journal of Dialectics of Nature] in Chinese
No 1, 10 Feb 89

[Article by He Zuoxiu: "On China's 'No First Use of Nuclear Weapons' Nuclear Strategy"]

[Text] I. China's Nuclear Strategy—the Nuclear Strategy of "No First Use of Nuclear Weapons"

China is currently engaged in a large-scale economic reconstruction, and it urgently needs a peaceful environment, but China is also faced with the situation in which the two superpowers, the United States and the Soviet Union, are confronting each other with tremendous nuclear capabilities. We need to ask: what kind of nuclear strategy should China have, and how should China explain the idea of its own "nuclear threat"? The opinions expressed herein are my own.

In fact, the nuclear strategy held by China is very clear and has often been publicly expressed, and that is that China holds the nuclear strategy of "no first use of nuclear weapons." On 25 March 1988 in a working report to the 7th Peoples's Congress, Premier Li Peng of the Chinese Government reaffirmed that "China is a developing country. We have a limited quantity of nuclear weapons, which are entirely for our own protection. The Chinese Government has on several occasions proclaimed to the world that at no time nor under any circumstances will we be the first to use nuclear weapons. What is more, since this statement in the spring of 1986, we have not conducted any large atmospheric tests. The Chinese Government has repeatedly stated and continues to maintain that the two nations holding more than 97 percent of the world's nuclear weapons, the

United States and the Soviet Union, should take the lead in stopping the testing, production, and deployment of nuclear weapons, and also that they should greatly reduce their nuclear weapons. Having achieved this, the necessary conditions would be created for an international nuclear disarmament conference to be held for all nuclear nations and that would have broad representation."

Why, then, does China adopt this kind of nuclear strategy? And how is China actually implementing this kind of nuclear strategy?

II. Why Should China Adopt a "No First Use of Nuclear Weapons" Nuclear Strategy?

China's development of nuclear weapons began at the end of the 1950's. At that time, China had been isolated from the international community and had been surrounded by the two major nuclear nations, the United States and the USSR. Faced with such a grim international predicament, China had no choice but to correspondingly develop its own limited nuclear capability to counter the U.S.-USSR nuclear threat. These are the historical reasons for China to develop its own independent nuclear capability at that time. But China is a peace-loving country, and the New China after the founding of the PRC has never acted nor intended to invade, pressure, or enslave another country. China is also a developing nation, with limited economic power. This determines that China's nuclear strategy can only be **defensive and limited**. This, then, is the nuclear strategy of "no first use of nuclear weapons at any time or under any conditions" that the Chinese government has often stated.

Why should China adopt a nuclear strategy that is defensive and not offensive? In addition to the fact that China is a peace-loving nation and that there is no reason nor any necessity for it to use nuclear weapons to attack other people, there is also the reason that China is a large country with a very large land mass, a large population, and a distinct political, economic, and military strength. Assuming that it would not employ nuclear weapons, there is no country in the world that can easily overcome China using a conventional military force. Therefore, even if China were invaded by powerful enemies there would be no necessity for it to use nuclear weapons to destroy an enemy's conventional force, and even in the event of a civil war there would be no need to use nuclear weapons to deal with its own countrymen.

One question worth looking into is: when China is threatened, provoked, or invaded politically or militarily by a nuclear nation, using the "first strike nuclear attack" nuclear strategy, may China make a sudden surprise attack, greatly eliminating the nuclear force and conventional strength of the opposing force, thereby ensuring a military victory? No! In addition to the fact that this would entail accepting the political responsibility of being the "first to provoke a nuclear war," we

would in reality be far from capable of such a thing. China is a developing nation, we have only limited strength, and we have stockpiled a number of very limited nuclear weapons, which are completely insufficient to counter the nuclear weapons of the superpowers. If we were to adopt a "first nuclear strike" strategy, we would not only be incapable of the goal of eliminating the enemy's nuclear capability, but we would also "get burned while playing with matches."

Some people feel that since China's current nuclear capability is still quite limited, we definitely should not, and cannot, use the strategy of "first nuclear strike." But in the sense that China's economy is rapidly growing and approaching world stability, the two superpowers alone, the USSR and the United States, are insufficient to maintain world peace or a balance of power. There should be a third; namely, the participation of the nuclear force of China as one of the Third World countries before world stability can be maintained. It is just as with a table: two legs are far from able to sufficiently support it, and at least three are needed to maintain stability. Moreover, this third leg must be of the same length. This is the so-called "nuclear triangle" concept. And based on this idea, China should rapidly develop its own nuclear capability to achieve a triangular equilibrium with the USSR and the United States!

No! I cannot agree with this suggestion! China is a developing country and per capita gross national output value is only about \$300-400, while that for the United States is nearly \$20,000. That is a nearly 50-fold difference! The Chinese economy is growing rapidly, but this kind of growth must first satisfy the need for clothing, food, housing, and transportation of more than 1 billion people. How could we come up with huge amounts of capital to arm our troops as have the USSR and the United States! Even over the next 100 years, China's economy is not going to have that capacity. China, in fact, has spent a certain amount of money on the development of nuclear weapons. But this has been quite limited. In all, China has carried out only 33 nuclear tests, only about one-twentieth those of the US, while Chinese scientists and technicians are constantly strictly budgeting to save every cent. The success rate of China's nuclear testing is the highest in the world. Therefore, the development expenses spent by China on nuclear weapons is at most only 1-1.5 percent that of the United States. Some foreign sources have said that China has spent one-half its military funds for nuclear weapons, thus putting an enormous burden on the Chinese people. That is completely false. But if China were to adopt the strategy of the "nuclear triangle," that would sacrifice the standard of living of the Chinese people and would hinder the reconstruction and China's economy and culture. Current Soviet leaders have all seen that the Soviet military burden has been too great, and they are urgently changing their policies. What need do we have to retrace the path the Soviet Union has already tread?

The Chinese Government has stated on several occasions that "China is not trying to be a superpower." It

should be said that China does have certain characteristics that could make it a superpower. China's population is one-fifth that of the entire world, the surface area is one-tenth that of the world, and it has significant real power from its resources and economy. But if those capabilities are compared with those of the USSR and the United States, there are still great gaps, and although in 100 years the real economic power of China will have grown, as far as the living standard that our people will have been able to attain, we will still be a country at a medium level. The Chinese people themselves have several problems that await resolution, so what need is there to greatly expand our military might and seek hegemony in the world? There is a certain glory in being a superpower for those countries that can be such, but it also brings heavy responsibilities. "China is not trying to be a superpower" is a long-held policy arrived at only through much thought and careful consideration. Said more directly, China's not becoming a superpower is better for both the Chinese people and the people of the world. In the United Nations, some Third World countries friendly to China once suggested that they hoped China could be the representative for protecting the rights of the Third World. The rights of the Third World must be protected, but there is certainly no need for China to become the representative of the Third World. This is because China simply has no intention of becoming a superpower nation sufficient to contend with the USSR and the United States! What is this idea of a "nuclear triangle"? Does it mean that China should militarily be foremost a nuclear power by which to seek a position of real power equivalent to the USSR and the United States? Why should an idea like this be China's goal?

III. China's "Nuclear Threat" Is a "Nuclear Threat" To Oppose the Undertaking of an Enemy Attack on "Soft Targets"

"No first use of nuclear weapons" is not only a dignified political guarantee, but has also been built on a cool assessment of opposing strengths. The use of nuclear weapons has the following three goals: The first is to eliminate an enemy's nuclear strength, that is, what we call "hard targets"; the second is to eliminate an enemy's conventional strength, for example, naval ship-borne forces and columns of land-based tanks; and the third is to eliminate an enemy's market economy and transport supply lines. The latter two goals are what we mean by "soft targets," but the nuclear capability is the component against which an enemy is most thorough in defense and that is least easily attacked. Destroying an enemy's launch silos or its nuclear submarines that are roaming through the high seas would require a nuclear capability several times greater. The soft targets are most susceptible to attack, the component against which it is hardest to defend. Even if President Reagan's "Star Wars" is successfully realized, it is not likely to be able to defend all soft targets. As soon as the soft targets have been struck, serious economic or political consequences will follow, and these are difficult for a modern nation to

accept. In contrast, China has a greater capacity to withstand that. What is this idea of China's "nuclear threat?" China's "nuclear threat" is founded on the ability to launch limited retaliation against an enemy's "soft targets." Having this sort of "nuclear threat" would be sufficient to ensure our national security to a certain degree.

Some people might not agree with this opinion. They feel that since mankind has had armed forces for resistance, military attack and defense are matters that have permeated all military struggle. Since the United States has had nuclear weapons, the Soviet Union has also had nuclear weapons. Faced with this situation, the United States has surrounded the Soviet Union with a large number of military bases, building up the American "nuclear threat." The Soviet Union quite unexpectedly developed ICBMs, launched several satellites, and covered U.S. territory with a nuclear threat. On the one hand, the United States had to keep one-third of its nuclear weapons in the air to ensure that in the event of a sudden Soviet nuclear attack, it would still have the capability of carrying out a nuclear retaliation; on the other hand, they also developed nuclear-powered submarines fitted with Polaris-class nuclear missiles, which then greatly increased the concealment and mobility of the American nuclear capability, breaking up the "first nuclear strike" threat of the Soviet Union. Following this, each side has made its surprise moves and nuclear warheads have become more and more numerous, until, according to statistics, both sides each has more than 20,000 nuclear warheads, sufficient to exterminate the other many times over! Why does each side require so large a stockpile? The reason is that both sides have as their primary goals the attack on each other's nuclear capability, both are defending against the other's "first nuclear strike," and both want to possess the strength to fight "one and a half nuclear wars" or to fight "two nuclear wars." Over the past few years, U.S. President Reagan also advocated the "Star Wars" plan, by which is intended to erect a "Great Wall" to defend against nuclear attack. Therefore, all these post-war arms races and various other measures are the normal manifestations of military attack and defense. China's declaration that it "will not first use nuclear weapons" is perhaps politically an enlightened "elevated posture," but militarily it is not necessarily a wise measure. The most effective way to protect China would still be by developing our own nuclear capability. Only by exterminating an enemy can one effectively preserve oneself. This is a military rule that has held throughout time for both the attack and defense sides of a military struggle!

Truly, as far as the rules of military development are concerned, the foregoing discussion is not likely to be controversial. But to support or limit the full development of the laws of military affairs, there are also the aspects of the laws of politics and of economics. To use the arms race between the Soviet Union and the United States as an example, both sides are aware of this heavy responsibility. The USSR especially has limited

improvement in the standards of living of its people because of its excessive military commitment. This is reflected in the demands for political reforms and in the demand for alleviation of the internationally tense situation. Recently, the USSR withdrew its troops from Afghanistan, and this was not a serious military loss for the Soviet Union, but was foremost the consequence of political and economic laws.

Nuclear war is a war of international scale. It is even more prone to restriction by political or economic laws. The current most important political laws are that the peoples of both opposing countries and China are afraid of nuclear war, and all fear attack by nuclear weapons on soft targets. Politicians who are political representatives of the peoples of each country cannot but reflect that urgent hope of their people, cannot but represent all their people on this point, which is also to the benefit of those within ruling levels. Therefore, when we discuss the question of nuclear warfare, the majority of politicians cannot act lightly or rashly. During the time of the Cultural Revolution, certain adventurer extremists in the USSR dreaded the development of a Chinese nuclear capability and advocated using "disemboweling" methods to annihilate China's nuclear base before it could become a "nuclear snake." Some people even consulted with the United States on this suggestion. After receiving this communication from the Soviets, the United States, which at that time was opposed to China, not only resolutely overruled this suggestion, but then notified China of this news through various channels. Premier Zhou Enlai of our government once made a very harsh statement regarding this. Why would the American Government of the time, in opposition to China, go so far as to oppose this suggestion? Because those politicians wanted to be responsible to their people and to history.

In a similar manner, Chinese politicians also adopted an extremely prudent attitude toward being directly or indirectly responsible for nuclear war. China certainly did not participate in the Nuclear Nonproliferation Treaty, nor was it a signer thereof. The reason China did not participate in this treaty was because the goal of the treaty was aimed at China. But China has certainly not taken an attitude of nonresponsibility regarding nuclear proliferation. China has received requests for nuclear aid from several friendly countries, which they have stated has been for reasons of defense. From a position of responsibility to the peoples of the world, China has politely refused these requests. A country or two has even been willing to pay the high price of \$2 billion for one Chinese nuclear weapon. Even though China is currently engaged in reconstruction and is in urgent need of hard currency, the politicians of China have not adopted a "short-sighted" policy in exchange for such immediate profits.

Many researchers have publicly noted that in a nuclear war there will be no victors! Actually, even though during a nuclear war one side might crush the other and therefore will have won the war, this would create new

possibilities for a third party. There is an old saying in China: "When the snipe and the clam grapple, the fisherman profits!" We might ask whether a smart politician would rather be the snipe or the clam?

Therefore, what China needs is a limited defensive nuclear retaliation. This is not only more reasonable economically, but is rather more advantageous politically, and even has a significant military assurance. China should publicly announce that the concept of China's "nuclear threat" is to counter the "soft targets" of opposing nations, and that whether in the air, on land, or on the seas, when China is one side involved, then when China's military forces, nuclear forces, or peaceful cities are hit by a nuclear attack, the "soft targets" of the enemy in question will be immediately hit by a "nuclear counterattack" by China. China should not entertain any notion of a "limited nuclear war," that is, where the two sides limit themselves to attack or counterattack targets, or limit themselves to the so-called tactical nuclear weapons. This sort of defensive nuclear strategy by China would not only be a nuclear strategy in accordance with the rules of military attack and defense, but would also be a nuclear strategy that followed political rules, for the Chinese masses would rise up to oppose the governments of all countries "first" instigating a nuclear war.

IV. The Nuclear Policy China Should Adopt in the Event of the So-Called "Deep Cuts"

The United States and the Soviet Union are currently engaged in talks about nuclear disarmament. In December of this last year [1988], these two countries signed a treaty to eliminate medium-range and short-to-medium range missiles. And it is also possible that in the near future they will have reached agreement to reduce their strategic nuclear weapons by 50 percent. However, as Premier Li Peng has pointed out: "Even if the United States and the Soviet Union reduce their strategic nuclear weapons by half, the nuclear weapons they still possess will account for more than 90 percent of those left in the world, and the task of disarmament will remain an arduous one." Under these conditions, China will naturally still retain a limited capability for nuclear retaliation, that is, when China is attacked in a "first nuclear strike," we will do our best to find ways to at least preserve a certain number of nuclear warheads with which to threaten the soft enemy targets. The specific numbers will be in keeping with the "survivability rate" for nuclear missiles when China is undergoing a "first nuclear strike," as well as with the "percentage of hits" and "penetration rate" for Chinese missiles. This will be the smallest requirement for China in its nuclear strategy (its "nuclear minimum").

All over the world there are people with lofty ideals who have ardently embraced the cause of peace, and they are now advocating that after the United States and the Soviet Union truly realize the 50 percent reduction in strategic nuclear weapons, that they should go further by seeking to effect what are called "deep cuts." Professor

Garwin has also suggested that the United States and the USSR should each retain only 1,000 nuclear warheads. This would mean that neither side would have the capability of wiping out the other's nuclear capability, but would also maintain a distinct balanced nuclear threat by which to realize the "nuclear security" of each, that is, to achieve the so-called "weak balance." To implement this goal, Professor Garwin has also suggested that England, France, and China also undertake corresponding reductions, where each would retain no more than 200 nuclear warheads; this would avoid upsetting the "weak balance" between the United States and USSR, which would then lead to a breakup of the "deep cuts."

From the point of view of ensuring world peace, this sort of suggestion is undoubtedly praiseworthy because it would greatly reduce the possibility of a nuclear war breaking out. If this suggestion had any chance of being implemented, China would reconsider its own nuclear strategy. China would undoubtedly not change its policy whereby it "does not seek to be a superpower," and China would not use that situation to take the opportunity to expand its own nuclear capability, bringing it to a position equivalent to that of the US and USSR. This is because China has no intention of seeking a world nuclear hegemony. What China desires is after all a **minimum, limited nuclear security**. If all countries of the world were greatly eliminating their nuclear weapons, this would obviously improve the "survivability" of China's nuclear weapons, after which there would be no need to keep too many, that is, no more than needed for a nuclear counterattack. In the event of that new situation, there would be a specific figure for China's minimum nuclear security, which would depend upon the specific research of many experts.

Naturally, the ideas just expressed are derived under the following two premises: 1. the so-called "Strategic Defense Initiative" has yet to make any remarkable progress, and has therefore not yet changed the current situation of nuclear balance; 2. regions bordering China, including the current regime on Taiwan, has not shown any new nuclear capabilities, and if that situation should change, China could not but reconsider its nuclear policies.

V. China Will Work Hard To Completely Ban and Eliminate Nuclear Weapons, Chemical Weapons, and Other Large-Scale Destructive Weapons, and Will Greatly Reduce Its Conventional Forces

Under the premise that the rest of the world has yet to agree to completely ban and eliminate nuclear weapons, China has no choice but to continue to improve its own nuclear technology. China will continue to improve the ratio between its nuclear equivalence and the weight of warheads, developing nuclear warheads and missiles with a distinct defense capability, and improving the hit percentages and accuracy of its missiles; and it will comprehensively improve the qualities of smallness and

lightness for nuclear weapons and their launch devices, and will add to their mobility and concealment. China will also oppose the use of outer space for military purposes; and it even more opposes carrying out an arms race in outer space. If this trend cannot be effectively turned around, China will also consider corresponding policies.

Naturally, the final goals for China are as Premier Li Peng has indicated: "China will go on as before, in keeping with all peace-loving nations, and will continue its struggle on behalf of stopping the arms race, on behalf of the complete ban and elimination of nuclear weapons, chemical weapons, and other large-scale destructive weapons, and toward greatly reducing conventional forces."

Author's biography: He Zuoxiu, male, born 27 July 1927 (lunar calendar) in Shanghai. Employed in the Chemistry Department of Shanghai's Jiaotong University 1945-47, He Zuoxiu graduated in 1951 from the Physics Department of Qinghua University. Beginning in 1951, he served subsequently as assistant researcher, researcher, and assistant director at the following Chinese Academy of Sciences institutes: Modern Physics, Atomic Energy, High Energy Physics, and Theoretical Physics. He has for a long time been engaged in particle physics and theoretical physics research, as well as on relevant questions in philosophy, economics, and the history of science, in which fields he has published various papers. In 1980 he became a Member of the Division of Mathematics and Physics of the Chinese Academy of Sciences.

JAPAN

Foreign Minister Uno Comments on Soviet Troop Cut in Far East
OW1905053589 Tokyo KYODO in English 0502 GMT 19 May 89

[Text] Tokyo, May 19 KYODO—Foreign Minister Sosuke Uno on Friday welcomed a Soviet troop cut in the Far East but said it will not change the "basic structure of confrontation between the East and the West."

Uno made the statement in a session of the Special Committee on Security of the House of Representatives.

The foreign minister said Soviet President Mikhail Gorbachev's announcement in Beijing this week that the Soviet Union will withdraw 120,000 troops from the Soviet Far East is "a step toward a reasonable direction."

But he said the Soviet action will not immediately lead to drastic changes in the structure of confrontation between the East and the West and added, "no optimism is warranted."

Uno said Japan will continue to promote dialogue with Eastern bloc nations, especially the Soviet Union, for improvement in relations between the East and the West.

Foreign Ministry Reaffirms Nonnuclear Principles
OW1905020889 Tokyo KYODO in English 1507 GMT 18 May 89

[By Tim Johnson]

[Text] Tokyo, May 18 KYODO—The transit of nuclear weapons through Japanese territorial waters is subject to a strict prohibition on the "introduction" of nuclear weapons into the country, a Foreign Ministry spokesman said Thursday.

Spokesman Taizo Watanabe's statement was designed to put to rest speculation that the conveyance of nuclear arms aboard U.S. naval ships and submarines may not necessarily amount to the proscribed "introduction" of the weapons into Japan.

The clarification comes amid a growing controversy surrounding the 1965 loss of an H-bomb from the U.S. aircraft carrier Ticonderoga in international waters some 320 miles off densely-populated Okinawa.

The inert 1-megaton bomb is believed to have leaked nuclear materials during its 4,800 meter descent to the ocean bed.

Reports that the Ticonderoga was en route to a Japanese naval port at the time of the accident has fueled conjecture that the U.S. has been routinely violating a "prior consultation" agreement in force at the time.

The U.S., which neither confirms nor denies the presence of nuclear weapons aboard its naval vessels, is also alleged to have run afoul of Japan's so-called "three non-nuclear principles," espoused as government policy some two years later in 1968.

While not inscribed in law, the policy prescribes "not possessing nuclear weapons, not producing them and not permitting their introduction into Japan."

The U.S., pressed by Japan for an explanation of the incident, issued a brief statement last Monday that the bomb presented no environmental hazard.

The Pentagon also said that the U.S. has "faithfully honored" its obligations under the 1960 Japan-U.S. Security Treaty, but officials would not comment on allegations to the contrary.

Watanabe refuted remarks attributed to former U.S. ambassador to Japan Edwin Reischauer that the two governments had a secret agreement exempting the mere transit of nuclear weapons through Japan.

"That is a different interpretation from the official interpretation of our principles," the Foreign Ministry's spokesman said.

"It's true the three principles are not a law," said another ministry official. "But they are principles that our government has openly announced before the Diet and we have been abiding by them as a law."

The official said the prohibition on the transit of nuclear weapons as implied in the three principles is equally applicable to the two countries' accord on prior consultations.

Under the bilateral security treaty, any major changes in U.S. armaments in Japan would be the subject of advance notification.

Japanese officials say that accord has always been mutually understood as encompassing nuclear weapons through a separate oral agreement and exchange of notes.

Watanabe said, however, that Japan has never received such a request from the U.S. to transport nuclear weapons through its territory since the security treaty went into force.

The government has been under strong pressure from opposition parties, citizen's groups and Okinawan inhabitants to shed more light on the Ticonderoga incident.

Watanabe said that the government has not taken any action on the issue since it received the U.S. explanation of the incident last Monday and convened a meeting of experts from various ministries to study the environmental implications.

"If and when further information is received, we may have another round of consultations," he said.

Officials said that when the expert group reconvenes, they will present the Foreign Ministry with a list of environmental impact-related questions they wish to clear up with the U.S. side.

Questioned on Japan's request that Washington explain whether the *Ticonderoga* went to Japan after the accident or not, Watanabe said, "We have not received a response."

He said that Japan has not been able to determine on its own the validity of media reports that the ship docked in Yokosuka, a major naval base south of Tokyo.

Watanabe would not predict what would happen if it became known that the U.S. did indeed bring nuclear weapons to Japan.

"We just trust that America could abide by this stipulation with regard to prior consultation," he said.

THAILAND

Further on Controversy over Thai Workers at Libyan Chemical Plant

U.S. Pressure Criticized
BK1905152389 Bangkok NAEON in Thai
19 May 89 p 16

[Text] Director General of the Foreign Ministry's Information Department Chet Sucharitkun said at the Foreign Ministry on 18 May that at present Thailand is under pressures from the United States and Libya about Thai workers in Libya. However, we have tried to handle the issue as best as we can.

Chet said that the U.S. threat to take action against the alleged chemical weapons plant in Al-Rabithah, where some Thai workers are working, is inappropriate and that it should not make such a threat. He said that 3 years ago, Thailand, in its capacity as a member of the UN Security Council, joined other members in denouncing the U.S. bombing of Libya. The United States should think about how we would react if Thai workers were killed by a U.S. bombing.

He added that "the United States should not threaten or make the situation worse. We have tried with every means by taking into account the interests of the Thai workers in Libya because each worker paid about 30,000 to 40,000 baht to go overseas to work. Thai laborers working in foreign countries send billions of baht back home each year. As a result, problems affecting Thai workers in foreign countries are regarded as important issues to be solved.

Prime Minister, Libyan Envoy Discuss Issue
BK1805152089 Bangkok Domestic Service in Thai
1200 GMT 18 May 89

[Text] At 1100 today at Government House, Libyan Ambassador to the Philippines Salim M. Adam called on Prime Minister General Chatchai Chunhawan. After the meeting, Adam told reporters that he had conveyed Libyan President [title as heard] Colonel al-Qadhdhafi's good wishes to the Thai prime minister and an invitation for the prime minister to visit Libya. The date for the visit will be worked out later.

Asked about the issue concerning Thai laborers reportedly working at a weapons-producing factory in Libya, which may be bombed, he pointed out that the news reports concerning the Thai workers in Libya are not true. He said Thai workers have been adjusting to the environmental and cultural conditions in Libya and to the Libyan people. Libya also needs Thai workers. The number of Thai workers in Libya is believed to be more than 20,000. He said the factory produces medicines for Middle Eastern countries, and is not a chemical factory as alleged. At present there are also no Thai workers in the factory. Most Thai workers [in Libya] are construction workers.

Asked whether Libyan President Col al-Qadhdhafi will visit Thailand if the Thai prime minister pays a visit to Libya, he replied that since both countries have good relations, it is very possible that President al-Qadhdhafi will visit Thailand.

Replying to reporters' questions, Prime Minister Chatchai said that the Libyan ambassador called on him to extend an invitation to visit Libya. He will inform the public later when the visit will take place. This morning's meeting had nothing to do with the Thai workers in Libya. The prime minister also did not raise the issue of the Thai workers. He said that he did not know much about the factory in question because he had never seen it. The prime minister said the Libyan ambassador had told him that there are no problems concerning the Thai workers and that there was no threat about expelling the Thai workers; he just invited the prime minister to visit Libya.

Stricter Screening Policy
BK2005100489 Bangkok SIAM RAT in Thai
20 May 89 pp 1, 2

[Text] Deputy Interior Minister Watthana Atsawahem said during an interview that the news about a U.S. threat to bomb the technology center at Al-Rabithah, believed by the United States to be a chemical weapons plant, has caused great concern for Thai workers and their families. In this connection, he has instructed the Labor Department to be stricter when approving Thai workers' applications to work in Libya. Screening should be done in greater detail, covering the nature of jobs, their locations, and the backgrounds of companies in Libya wishing to hire Thai workers.

As for long-term measures, Watthana said he made a policy in the Labor Department to carefully check the

records of job placement companies in Thailand applying to send workers to countries where there is a risk of war. He hoped that once the Labor Department is upgraded to a ministry, the problem of Thai workers abroad will be handled better as more officials will be posted to look after overseas workers. At present, there is not enough manpower.

According to a report from the Interior Ministry, the Thai labor attache in Athens, Greece visited the technology center at Al-Rabitah in early February to check on the safety of Thai workers there. He sent a report to the ministry saying that two Thai workers at the Al-Rabitah plant were injured by chemical substances while working and were in a hospital for treatment for a month. They have since returned to work.

Meanwhile, Director General of the Labor Department Siri Kewalinsarit said he could not confirm the above report because there could be mistakes. Concerning the situation at Al-Rabitah, he said that the Thai labor attache in Athens had reported that the situation was normal.

Thai Muslims Reproach U.S.
BK2305095489 Bangkok SIAM RAT in Thai
23 May 89 p 3

[Text] On 22 May at the Government House, a group of representatives of the Islamic Central Committee of Thailand [ICCT] submitted to Prime Minister General Chatchai Chunhawan a letter signed by its secretary general, Assistant Prof Dr Imron Malulim. In the letter, the ICCT expresses its support for the Chatchai Government's implementation of the foreign policy of strengthening relations with other countries. The letter praises the government for maintaining an independent stand on various issues, such as the U.S. Farm Act, the drug patents, the U.S. cutting of the Generalized System of Preferences for Thai products, and the U.S. congressional criticism of Thailand—which constitute interference in Thailand's internal affairs. The ICCT feels that the U.S. support for the State of Israel in Palestine without regard for humanitarian principles, justice, or basic human rights of the Palestinian people is the real cause of the problem in the Middle East. The letter says: "U.S. influence and its indirect and direct interference—behaving like world policeman—is a cause of the problem involving Thai workers in Libya."

Meanwhile, Aphinan Buranaphong, vice president of the Siamese Muslim Group, issued a statement saying that his group condemns the U.S. evil action against Libya in connection with the Libyan message to Thailand for the latter to pull its workers out of the site. [sentence as published]

"The U.S. act reveals its true character of a villain cloaked in a good guy's outfit. It wants to show that it has the influence to determine the fate of anyone who refuses to bow to it," says part of the statement.

U.S. Pledges Not To Attack Plant
BK2405005889 Bangkok THE NATION in English
24 May 89 p 2

[Text] The United States has assured Thailand that it will not attack Libya's alleged chemical arms plant in order to avoid hurting Thai workers there, a senior Thai Foreign Ministry official said yesterday.

Pratyathawi Tawethikun, deputy Foreign Ministry spokesman said the assurance was given "privately" to the ministry.

However, Pratyathawi said the ministry still expressed doubts on whether the US administration made the decision in response to recent Thai diplomatic moves or because of other factors.

Washington had reportedly been considering bombing the controversial plant in Al-Rabitah, 80 kilometers south of the Libyan capital of Tripoli, and had pressured the Thai government to evacuate about 200 Thai workers from the factory in order to clear the way for American attacks.

Losses to the lives of those Thai workers will certainly damage the Thai-US relationship.

The US assurance and a series of Thai diplomatic moves involving Libya recently have eased concerns in Bangkok over the safety of the Thai workers in the Arab country, Pratyathawi said.

Last week, Libya's ambassador to the Philippines met Prime Minister Chatchai Chunhawan and several high-ranking officials of the Foreign Ministry. The envoy told Thai leaders that Libya had never threatened to expel about 25,000 Thai workers in Libya and would not use the workers as a bargaining chip to counter the US threat, said Pratyathawi.

It had been reported that Libya would expel all Thai workers in the country if those at the controversial plant were evacuated.

Meanwhile, the House committee on foreign affairs yesterday praised the Thai government's diplomatic campaign involving the US, Libyan, and Israel governments to guarantee the safety of the Thai workers.

Surin Phitsuwan, the committee's spokesman, said that the government should take this opportunity to send a delegation to Libya to see what the real situation is, as well as to discuss with Tripoli on the overall living conditions of Thai workers.

Surin said confusion remained over the existence of Thai workers in al-Rabitah, and that the Thai government should make clarification.

31 May 1989

He quoted the Libyan ambassador to the Philippines as telling Thai leaders that there were no Thai workers in al-Rabitah except Libyans. However, Surin said the

House committee had been informed that 294 Thais have been employed in the chemical plant.

INTRABLOC AFFAIRS

Warsaw Pact Force Limitation Proposal at CFE Talks

CSSR Representative Submits Proposal

LD2305132989 Prague CTK in English
1235 GMT 23 May 89

[Text] Vienna May 23 (CTK correspondent)—Head of the Czechoslovak delegation to the Vienna discussions on conventional armed forces in Europe Ambassador Ladislav Balcar submitted here today on behalf of the Warsaw Treaty states a proposal providing for the upper limit of forces of the two groupings.

The measures should be realized within five to six years in all six categories proposed by the Warsaw Treaty states, he said.

Further Report

AU2405154689 Bratislava PRAVDA
in Slovak 19 May 89 p 7

[CTK report: "Contribution by CSSR Delegation Head"]

[Text] Vienna (By CTK reporter)—The Vienna negotiations on conventional armed forces in Europe continued yesterday [18 May] with a plenary session. The representatives of 23 member states of the two military alliances participating in this disarmament forum are currently considering the projects submitted by the Warsaw Pact and NATO, which should lead to an agreement.

The scope that is currently being opened for the activities of individual work groups should also help to make the course of the talks more dynamic. Oleg Grinevskiy, head of the Soviet delegation, yesterday came up with a proposal which further elaborates the project submitted by the Warsaw Pact states on setting numerical ceilings for all main destabilizing categories, i.e. for troop strengths, the tactical airforce, and also combat helicopters, tanks, guns, armored personnel carriers, and combat infantry vehicles.

Ladislav Balcar, head of the CSSR delegation, spoke in support of the Soviet proposal, calling it a significant constructive step toward preparing the future agreement. The realization of this step, he said, signified the achievement of the main purpose of current negotiations—to consolidate stability and security in Europe. The CSSR delegation head particularly underscored that it is essential to set an upper limit not only for military technology, but also for troop strengths. He said that troops and armament are an indivisible whole, an inseparable and simultaneously extremely important part of conventional armed forces. Their typical feature is their ability to conquer and retain territory. That is why we deem it essential not only to conduct negotiations about this category, but also to anchor its reduction and

limitation in specific form. We believe that the reduction of military personnel cannot be left to the functioning of some automatic, unspecified mechanism, the Czechoslovak ambassador stressed, and continued: On the one hand, NATO states say that armament reduction must inevitably lead to a reduction of personnel, while on the other hand they do not want to do so by limiting the numerical strengths of armed forces by means of firm final upper limits.

If no upper limit is set for the troops, then certain dangerous destabilizing effects can appear. This could result in the released troops spilling over into categories not included in the agreement, and thus in the creation of new asymmetries, Ladislav Balcar said.

Warsaw Pact Military Council Opens Berlin Session

LD2205162189 East Berlin ADN International Service
in German 1433 GMT 22 May 89

[Text] Berlin (ADN)—A regular session of the Military Council of the Warsaw Pact Joint Armed Forces opened today in the GDR Ministry of National Defense.

The members of the Military Council from the People's Republic of Bulgaria, the Hungarian People's Republic, the GDR, the People's Republic of Poland, the Socialist Republic of Romania, the USSR, and the CSSR, as well as the chief of the staff of the Joint Armed Forces, Army General Vladimir Lobov, are participating.

The meeting is headed by Army General Petr Lushev, commander in chief of the Joint Armed Forces.

Army General Heinz Kessler, member of the SED [Socialist Unity Party of Germany] Central Committee Politburo and minister of national defense, warmly welcomed the generals admirals, and officers from the fraternal armies on behalf of Erich Honecker, general secretary of the SED Central Committee and chairman of the GDR Council of State and chairman of the GDR National Defense Council.

In his remarks, the GDR defense minister acknowledged the multifarious and far-reaching disarmament initiatives made by the Soviet Union and the other Warsaw Pact states as an expression of the determination to continue the process of disarmament and detente without interruption. In opposition to this, certain influential forces from the United States and NATO were striving to move those states belonging to the North Atlantic alliance toward a continuation of the arms race, disastrous for all peoples, in a nuclear as well as a conventional sphere.

Therefore, it is in accordance with its security interests for the socialist community of states, and for the future, to develop a high level of political and military vigilance and unanimity in accordance with its military doctrine.

Army General Heinz Kessler expressed the certainty that the Military Council session will make a contribution toward the further implementation of the Warsaw Pact states' defense doctrine. Valuable impetus for the political, combat, and operational training of the commanders, staff, troops, and naval forces will emanate from it in order to resolve the joint tasks for the more secure protection of peace and the socialist achievements with an even higher degree of effectiveness. The GDR National People's Army will also continue to be a reliable coalition partner at the side of the Soviet Army and the other fraternal armies.

The commander in chief and the members of the Military Council of the Warsaw Pact Joint Armed Forces laid wreaths with military ceremony at the Unter den Linden monument for the victims of fascism and militarism and at the memorial to the fallen heroes of the Soviet Army in Berlin-Treptow.

Warsaw Pact Chief of Staff Writes on Asymmetry
*AU1805114089 Warsaw ZOLNIERZ WOLNOSCI
in Polish 26 Apr 89 p 4*

[APN article "specially for ZOLNIERZ WOLNOSCI" by Lieutenant General I. Lutov, deputy chief of staff of the Joint Armed Forces of the Warsaw Pact States: "Asymmetry on Both Sides"]

[Text] Talks between the 23 Warsaw Pact and NATO states on the subject of conventional armed forces in Europe commenced in Vienna on 6 March. A particular feature of these talks is that this is the first time concepts on the deployment of armed forces have been the subject of negotiations.

The Warsaw Pact and NATO are in favor of eliminating the potential that could be used to stage a sudden attack and start offensive action on a wide scale. The modern state of conventional armaments permits a smaller quantity of them to be used to inflict greater damage to the other side and gain an advantage. Therefore, the Warsaw Pact states have suggested that the main emphasis should be laid on eliminating the most destructive types of weapons.

And what is the ratio of these weapons on the European continent?

NATO has 1.5 times more combat aircraft than the Warsaw Pact; 1.9 times more helicopters and 2.4 times more maritime aircraft; 7.5 times more large warships, including aircraft carriers; 11.9 times more ships equipped with guided missiles; and 3.5 times more landing craft. In turn, the Warsaw Pact has 1.5 times more personnel carriers and armored vehicles, 1.9 times more tanks, and 1.3 times more artillery than NATO.

The West used to make and is still making propaganda about the Warsaw Pact's tank superiority in order to increase tension. However, Western analysts fail to take into account the fact that this superiority is the result of certain views on the build-up of armed forces.

As U.S. Defense Secretary J. Schlesinger said: "Modern antitank weapons, deployed in sufficient quantities, serve as compensation for the Warsaw Pact's superiority in tanks. Therefore, we do not consider it necessary to possess the same number of tanks as the Soviet Union." That is why NATO now has 1.6 times as many antitank systems as the Warsaw Pact. This fact is of major significance for the talks.

Taking this into account, the Warsaw Pact states have suggested that during the first stage of disarmament, lasting 2-3 years, the imbalance and asymmetry in basic weapons used by land and air forces should be eliminated.

Such a view is explained by the fact that the armed forces constitute a single organism in which land, air, and antimissile forces, plus the navy, cooperate with each other and mutually complement and consolidate each other. This is nothing other than the art of war.

And what does NATO say to this? The West is suggesting equal ceilings only in respect of three categories of weapons—basic tanks, artillery pieces, and armored vehicles. The West does not include tactical strike aircraft, combat helicopters, naval aircraft, and amphibious vehicles in the category of dangerous weapons that could be used in offensive action. The West claims that strike aircraft are not all that important when conducting general military operations.

One cannot believe Western experts are naive or ignorant of elementary concepts about the application of armed forces. The West is simply attempting to achieve military superiority over the Warsaw Pact.

It has long been known that the United States has worked out a concept called "Air-Land War 2000" as the basic method of conducting land operations. This concept is reflected in U.S. Army instruction FM 100-5. However, in NATO as a whole the above principles have been reflected in the "two-wave combat" ["walki z drugimi rzutami"] concept regarding army group activity and strategic activity in the theater of military operations (the Western press often describes these as "deep strike" concepts).

These "deep strike" concepts involve the destruction of the enemy in the entire area where his forces are deployed, by means of concerted and simultaneous attacks by land and air forces—and by naval air forces and marines in areas close to the sea. The concepts foresee close cooperation and interdependence between land, air, and naval forces during the performance of tasks on two levels—an operational level and a tactical

level. It is believed that such land-air combat activity will be most typical of the initial stage of the theater of military operations, where groups of forces will already have been placed on alert.

As part of the "deep strike" concept, tactical air forces carry out aerial attacks, supplying air support for land forces. The primary targets would be those left untouched by land forces due to their distance or isolation, so as to prevent the enemy from deploying subsequent waves of forces and reserves, and limit or prevent the possibility for him to regroup or resupply his forces.

As far as support for one's own land forces is concerned, the tactical air force possesses the greatest capability, especially in the destruction of tanks. For example, during a single sortie, one squadron of F-16 fighter-bombers using guided missiles can destroy over 50 tanks, and a squadron of A-10 fighters using guided missiles and 30-millimeter cannon can destroy over 100 tanks. Using guided missiles, a solitary aircraft like the "Alpha Jet" or "Tornado" can destroy up to 10 tanks, an entire armored company, in the course of 3-4 sorties.

Such air force capabilities in fighting tanks were eminently demonstrated during the war in the Middle East in October 1973. The Egyptian tank offensive in the Sinai was halted by attacks from Israeli aircraft using "Maverick" missiles.

Helicopters are also an effective weapon against tanks. A U.S. mechanized (armored) division has 42 AH-1 "Cobra" or AH-64A "Apache" antitank helicopters, plus 45 AH-1 multipurpose helicopters with programmable missiles (the AH-1 is armed with 8 "Tow" missiles, and the AH-64 A with 16 "Hellfire" missiles with a range of 8 km and a destructive factor of 0.95). Calculations by American experts show that by using such a quantity of helicopters over 550 tanks can be destroyed in a single sortie, whereby 12 tanks would be destroyed for every helicopter shot down.

An examination of all these aspects, in other words not just the quantities of various types of weapons possessed by various branches of the armed forces, but also the damage these weapons could inflict in warfare, led the Warsaw Pact Defense Ministers Committee to the conclusion that "military equilibrium in Europe, taking into account all its components, may be described as an approximate parity that prevents any side from attaining clear superiority." One side's superiority in any one type of weapon is offset by the other side's superiority in another type of weapon, so the combat capabilities of both blocs are more or less equal.

However, considering the capabilities of each side's forces, it is necessary to take into account yet another factor, which may play a decisive role in the theater of military operations. Such a factor is surprise attack. In such a situation the attacking side could quickly alter the balance of forces in the theater of military operations to

its advantage by wiping out the enemy's main concentrations of forces, command system, roads, and storage depots. The entire history of warfare shows that an aggressor always aims to carry out a surprise attack, which is a necessary condition for victory with the lowest possible loss of forces, resources, and time.

Today, at a time when the material back-up for armed combat is better than before, the role of a surprise attack has increased considerably. Surprise strategic attacks as a decisive condition for attaining war objectives have assumed prime importance. A strike air force is the basic means with which to carry out a surprise attack at the onset of hostilities, using conventional weapons.

Let us remember that it is by means of mass aerial attacks that fascist Germany commenced the war against the USSR, as a result of which important facilities in our rear, communications networks, and basic formations of our air force were wiped out after just a few hours. One should also make it clear that the Soviet Army achieved the final turnabout in the war, followed by its own offensive in 1943, not before it had gained superiority over Germany in the quality and quantity of air forces and gained strategic control over the air.

Israel's aggression vis-a-vis the Arab states in June 1967 is an excellent example of the element of surprise in local warfare. After the rapid destruction of the air forces of Egypt and Syria on the ground as a result of a surprise attack, their land forces, deprived of air support, soon disintegrated.

Surprise attacks using air forces are possible because it takes much less time to prepare air forces for an attack than land forces. Apart from that, aircraft can be made ready in secret. One should also remember that equipping air forces with accurate weapons like guided missiles considerably increases their ability to destroy the main enemy targets.

Such air force capabilities permit the NATO command to consider attacks by army groups formed in peacetime, without any preceding mobilization and without any deployment of weapons along state borders, as one way of starting a war.

In the time it takes for land forces to assume their starting positions for an attack, an air force can carry out several concentrated attacks throughout the entire theater of military operations, thus permitting a victory by the land forces.

That is why the Warsaw Pact considers the strike air force to be the most dangerous weapon. Without reducing this weapon, it is impossible to limit the potential for a surprise attack.

Thus, military parity between the Warsaw Pact and NATO, and therefore mutual security during the first stage of conventional armed forces reductions, is only

possible if the imbalance and asymmetry in basic types of weapons is eliminated, as the Warsaw Pact suggests. Because the two sides have decided not to talk about quantities, one cannot ignore NATO's concepts concerning the deployment of armed forces.

ALBANIA

NATO Missile Modernization Plans Deplored

AU2205164489 Tirana BASHKIMI
in Albanian 17 May 89 p 4

[Genc Kondi article: "Europe Haunted by a Fresh Missile Specter"]

[Excerpts] The problem of the modernization of short-range nuclear missiles stationed in the western part of the old continent, which has recently been set before NATO, is at the center of attention of the international public, especially in Europe. [passage omitted]

Political Friction in the Alliance

The problem can in no way be regarded as purely military. It relates to specific policies of the various NATO governments, especially within the context of their relations with the East. These governments must also consider the protests aroused by the "Euromissile" program at the start of the decade. The FRG, Italy, Greece, Belgium, Denmark, Spain, and Norway have openly expressed their opposition to this project. They seek a postponement of any decision until 1992, or the start of a process of Soviet-American talks aimed at including the elimination of missiles with a range of less than 500 km within the treaty for the elimination of intermediate-range missiles from Europe, signed in Washington last year.

In this context, James Baker, the new United States secretary of state, made his first visit abroad with the mission of persuading the unconvinced to accept the American plan. Washington called Baker's tour of the continent a "tough visit" and accused the Germans in particular of "a Teutonic sense of insecurity." France is in favor of a compromise: Let the Americans start producing their new missiles, and let the question of their deployment be decided later. As always, not only is London an ardent supporter of the American plan, but Thatcher is setting off on her own travels, in the role of Washington's special emissary, in order to persuade her European colleagues.

This problem has changed from being a simple matter to a key issue of NATO unity. Two possible things may happen at the forthcoming meeting at the end of May: Either the decision to modernize the missiles will be made, disregarding the friction, or a deadline will be fixed for attempting to reach an understanding with NATO's Eastern rivals. The general feeling is that the solution will be a compromise decision which will satisfy the Americans to a certain extent. "The disagreements in NATO are not as serious as it is

claimed," wrote THE TIMES on 21 January. Meanwhile, the Pentagon has won approval for the expenditure of \$33 million on the production of the first new missiles. However, even though Washington has not embarked on any discussion of NATO unity, it fears that its leadership will be jeopardized by the efforts of the Western Europeans to establish themselves as a second center of the alliance. This fear has been increased by the progress in the integration of the EEC, and cannot be assuaged by Thatcher's statements to the BBC that "It is NATO and not Europe (the EEC—our note) that is our strongest defense."

American-Soviet Flirtation and Europe's (In)security

George Kennan, the most prominent American Sovietologist, remarked last year that the "cold war" had come to an end with the great changes that have occurred in the Soviet Union. Of course, if it is a matter of Soviet-American relations and the struggle between two opposing social systems, this struggle ended 3 decades ago. However, the United States considers Moscow a rival within the context of interimperialist contradictions. The British Ministry of Defense, cited by REUTER (3 May 1989), believes that "The Soviet Union remains a military threat to the West." "There has been no significant change in Soviet military capability," commented Tower, the temporary United States defense secretary. For his part, the Soviet general Batenin wrote in the magazine NOVOYE VREMENYE in January that "The origin of World War III is in Europe." Bush stresses that "The security of the United States and its allies should not rest on hopes, but should rely on facts," and that "Only strengthening NATO will enable the NATO allies to achieve their policy goals." Under these conditions, it appears that the process of detente between Washington and Moscow is not solving, just as it never has solved, the acute problems of international relations. From the military point of view, Europe's security is increasingly under threat. Both long-range missiles, the most dangerous weapons in the superpowers' arsenal, and short-range missiles are being further modernized. Intermediate-range missiles are being modified: According to the magazine JANE'S DEFENSE WEEKLY in December 1988, 140 land-based cruise missiles have been modified and are now carried by ships, where they are not "covered" by the quotas of the Washington treaty. Conventional weapons are being increased and perfected. All these things give rise to an extremely difficult situation, with new dangers to peace.

CZECHOSLOVAKIA

CFE Limitations on Troop Numbers Urged

LD1805223989 Prague CTK in English
1800 GMT 18 May 89

[Text] Vienna May 18 (CTK correspondent)—The need for determining the upper limit not only for military technology, but also for the number of troops, was stressed by head of the Czechoslovak delegation Ladislav Balcar at talks on conventional forces here today.

We consider it necessary not only to talk about this category, but also to give its reduction and elimination a concrete appearance, he said. We think that reductions of military personnel cannot be left only to some automatic mechanism, he stated adding that on one hand, NATO countries say that armament reductions will inevitably lead to reductions of personnel, on the other hand, they do not want to do so by means of reducing the number of troops by firm upper limits.

If the upper limit for troops is not set, it can lead to the forming of a new asymmetry and destabilization effects, Ladislav Balcar stated.

1st Group of Soviet Tanks Leaves 23 May

Depart from Krupka Garrison

LD2305111689 Prague Domestic Service in Czech
1030 GMT 23 May 89

[Text] A military transport train carrying 23 T-72 tanks left the garrison of the Central Group of Soviet Troops at Krupka, in the district of Teplice, on its journey to Novorossiysk today. This is the first group of Soviet tanks to be withdrawn from Czechoslovak territory this year in line with the Soviet Government's decision. The withdrawal of the modern Soviet military equipment from the western half of our country began the day after the Warsaw Pact countries issued a challenge to the NATO countries to dissolve both military and political alliances, the first step toward which would be the demise of their respective military organizations.

In his briefing of Czechoslovak and foreign journalists, Lieutenant General Yuriy Shchepin, chief of staff of the Central Group of Soviet Forces, said that the withdrawal is a part of the implementation of the peace initiative and the unilateral reduction of the number of personnel and military equipment of Soviet Armed Forces as announced last December by Mikhail Gorbachev at the United Nations. A total of 1,500 Soviet soldiers will be withdrawn from Czechoslovakia this year, 192 tanks will leave on military transport trains, and 20 aircraft will be transferred.

Tanks To Be 'Melted Down'

LD2305135189 Prague CTK in English
1242 GMT 23 May 89

[Text] Prague May 23 (CTK)—A military train with 23 T-72 tanks, the first part of the overall number of 192 Soviet tanks which are to be withdrawn this year from Czechoslovakia in harmony with the decision of the Soviet Government, left today the town of Krupka in northern Bohemia.

The withdrawal of modern Soviet military technology from the western part of Czechoslovakia started one day after the Warsaw Treaty states publicly appealed to

NATO countries to dissolve the two military political groupings. The first step should be the dissolution of their military organizations.

Major General Yuriy Shchepin, chief of staff of the Central Group of Soviet Troops, told journalists at the Bohosudov railway station that the withdrawal is part of the realization of the peace initiative and one-sided reduction of the number of soldiers and military technology of the Soviet Armed Forces announced by Mikhail Gorbachev at the December U.N. General Assembly session in New York. The Armed Forces of the Soviet Union will be gradually decreased by 500,000 soldiers, 10,000 tanks and further military technology. 1,500 Soviet soldiers, 192 tanks and 20 planes will be withdrawn from Czechoslovakia this year, he said, adding that part of the troops have already been withdrawn.

Answering a question concerning the fate of the T-72 tanks he said that some of them will be melted down and some will be used in agriculture as special machines after removing all weapons from them.

Military Attaché of West German Embassy in Czechoslovakia Adolf Brueggemann stressed in his interview for CTK that the possibility to follow the withdrawal of the Soviet tanks is a demonstration of great openness and sincerity of the Soviet policy and appreciated the development of contacts between the West German and Soviet military representatives.

GERMAN DEMOCRATIC REPUBLIC

Soviet Troops Continue Prenzlau Withdrawal

25th Tank Division Leaves

LD1805114389 East Berlin ADN International Service
in German 1044 GMT 18 May 89

[Text] Neubrandenburg (ADN)—The withdrawal of Soviet tank troops from the GDR continues today in Prenzlau Neubrandenburg Bezirk [area]. Hundreds of workers and soldiers of the GDR National People's Army (NVA) had gathered in the town around noon to see off members of the 25th tank division of the Group of Soviet Forces in Germany on their journey home.

Wolfgang Hermann, first secretary of the Prenzlau Socialist Unity Party of Germany District executive, praised the various disarmament initiatives from the USSR and stressed the GDR's contribution to peace and security.

Domestic and foreign journalists once again had the opportunity to follow the fulfillment to the letter of the announced unilateral prior concessions for reducing the troops and armament of the socialist armies.

Population Bids Farewell

*LD1805171789 East Berlin ADN International Service
in German 1212 GMT 18 May 89*

[Excerpts] Prenzlau (ADN)—The withdrawal of Soviet tank troops from the GDR continued on Thursday. With the population of Prenzlau (Neubrandenburg Bezirk) showing great sympathy, a transport train loaded with men and battle technology began the journey around midday to the pre-arranged dispersal location of Zhdanovka in the Kiev military area.

The strength of the 25th tank division in Vogelsang, which is to be withdrawn and dispersed by August of this year along with the 32d tank division of the group of Soviet Forces in Germany (GSFG) in Jueterbog (both in Potsdam Bezirk), is being reduced by this withdrawal. [passage omitted]

Present at the farewell were: Johannes Chemnitzer, member of the Central Committee and first secretary of the Neubrandenburg Bezirk Socialist Unity Party of Germany Organization; Army General Boris Snetkov, GSFG commander in chief; and Colonel General Nikolay Moiseyev, Military Council member and GSFG Political Directorate chief. [passage omitted]

The event was attended, at the invitation of the GSFG commander in chief, by the chiefs of the accredited military missions of the United States—Colonel Govan, Great Britain—Brigadier Foley, and France—Colonel Souque [all names as received].

Sergey Rogov, deputy head of the Group for the Public Observation of the Unilateral Withdrawal of the Soviet Armed Forces and Arms, was present and he briefed journalists on the disarmament initiatives of the USSR, the GDR, and the other socialist states.

U.S. Request for CDE Inspection on GDR Territory Granted

*LD1805212989 East Berlin ADN International Service
in German 1702 GMT 18 May 89*

[Text] Berlin (ADN)—The U.S. Government applied on 17 May 1989 for an inspection, on the basis of the determinations of the Stockholm document on confidence- and security-building measures and disarmament in Europe, on the territory of the German Democratic Republic. It is expected to begin on 19 May 1989 and take place in the Biere, Calvoerde, Nebelin, Toddin, Kirch Stueck, Roedlin, and Medewitz areas.

At present a joint troop exercise of the Group of Soviet Forces in Germany and the National People's Army is taking place in this area. Up to 20,100 Army personnel, and in accordance with an invitation from the GDR Government, 40 maneuvers observers from 20 CSCE states are participating.

The GDR has permitted the request and entry of the U.S. inspectors.

All participant states in the Stockholm Conference are being informed of this through diplomatic channels.

CSCE Members Observe Soviet-GDR Exercise**Gen Rumyantsev Comments**

*LD1905203789 East Berlin ADN International Service
in German 1318 GMT 19 May 89*

[Text] Potsdam (ADN)—Forty observers from 20 CSCE signatory states, who have been in the GDR since Tuesday [16 May], observed the joint troop exercise of the Group of Soviet Forces in Germany [GSFG] and the National People's Army [NVA] of the GDR today. The generals, officers, and diplomats were informed about the situation and progress of the defense actions.

In close association with air force units, antiaircraft missile troops, and other military experts, the guardsmen of the tank regiment under Colonel Valentin Lesnov proved their efficiency.

The commander of the exercise, Major General Stanislav Rumyantzev, commanding officer of an army in the GSFG, told ADN that in the past few days the participants had acted with dedication and military skill. True to the military doctrine of the Warsaw Pact states, on which the training is based, the capacity for joint defense was further perfected.

The same day, further units and troop formations from the exercise region of Gardelegen, Magdeburg, Brandenburg, Neustrelitz, and Pritzwalk returned to their garrisons after successfully fulfilling their mission. The foreign guests were able to observe the overland march and rail transport.

During the course of the day the number of army personnel in the exercise region thus fell below 17,000 men. The observer activity of the foreign representatives thus ended, in line with the Stockholm document on Confidence- and Security-Building Measures and Disarmament in Europe. In the name of the GDR Government and on behalf of the defense minister, Army General Heinz Kessler, the observers were given a cordial send off this evening by Major General Rudolf Magnitzke, deputy chief of the NVA Main Staff. He stated they had had many chances to convince themselves that the Stockholm document was adhered to by the GDR. It has become clear to the observers from the talks that the members of the forces involved wish for a peaceful future and harbor no hatred for other peoples, he said.

Exercises Continue

*AU1805153089 East Berlin NEUES DEUTSCHLAND
in German 17 May 89 p 2*

[Text] Potsdam (ADN)—The joint troop exercise of the Group of Soviet Forces in Germany [GSFG] and the National People's Army [NVA] continued on Tuesday [16 May]. Motorized riflemen, tank soldiers, and artillerymen improved their combat positions in terms of the way they are engineered and are preparing for defense action. Up to 20,100 members of both fraternal armies are engaged in the exercise, which is headed by Major General Stanislav Rumyantsev, commander of a GSFG unit. A total of 314 tanks, 311 artillery pieces, 393 launchers for antitank missiles, and 51 helicopters are involved in the exercise. This means 500 soldiers and 94 tanks fewer than the GDR Government originally announced.

In accordance with the documents of the Stockholm Conference on Confidence- and Security-Building Measures and Disarmament in Europe, 40 observers from 20 CSCE signatory states are participating in this exercise. They come from Belgium, Bulgaria, the FRG, CSSR, Denmark, Finland, France, Great Britain, Italy, the SFRY, Canada, the Netherlands, Norway, Austria, Poland, Sweden, Switzerland, Spain, Hungary, and the United States.

On behalf of the GDR Government and at the order of Army General Heinz Kessler, minister of National Defense, the generals, officers, and diplomats were welcome in Potsdam by Major General Rudolf Magnitzke, deputy chief of the NVA Main Staff. The GDR is consistently working for more confidence, security, and predictability in the military sector, he said. Together with its allies, the GDR advocates that, in the framework of the Vienna talks and without losing any time, efficient agreements will be concluded, particularly to reduce armed forces and armaments in Europe.

The beginning of the disbanding of NVA tank regiments and the withdrawal of GSFG troops from GDR territory stress the serious nature and credibility of all our proposals and prove that word and deed are in harmony, Magnitzke said. The GDR believes that verbal declarations are no longer sufficient today, but that concrete deeds are required to achieve further detente, more security, and disarmament, Major General Magnitzke noted.

Subsequently, the foreign military officials and diplomats were familiarized with the course of the exercise and the observation program. On the basis of a map, they were informed about the additional possibility of observing the action areas of the staffs and troops on board helicopters.

Observers Depart

*AU2405155689 East Berlin NEUES DEUTSCHLAND
in German 20-21 May 89 p 2*

[Text] Potsdam (ADN)—On Friday [19 May], the 40 observers of the maneuvers from 20 CSCE signatory states, who have been in the GDR since Tuesday, were following the action at the Wittstock training area during the joint troop exercises of the Group of Soviet Forces in Germany [GSFG] and the National People's Army [NVA]. The generals, officers, and diplomats were briefed on the situation and the course of the defense actions.

The head of the exercise, Major General Stanislav Rumyantsev, commander of a GSFG unit, told ADN that the participants in the exercise had acted with combat-readiness and military skill during the past few days.

On the same day, and after having successfully carried out their order, more units and forces were transferred to their garrisons from the exercise areas of Magdeburg, Brandenburg, Neustrelitz, and Pritzwalk. The international guests were able to directly observe overland movement and rail transportation. Thus, in the course of the day the number of army members in the exercise area fell below 17,000 men. The observer activity of the foreign representatives thus ended in line with the Stockholm Conference on Confidence-and Security-Building Measures and Disarmament in Europe.

On behalf of the GDR Government, and on the order of Defense Minister Army General Heinz Kessler, the observers were given a cordial send off this evening in Potsdam by Major General Rudolf Magnitzke, deputy chief of the NVA Main Staff. He stated that they had had many opportunities to see for themselves that the Stockholm documents had been adhered to by the GDR. From the talks, it was made clear to the observers that the army members of the forces involved wished a peaceful future and felt no hatred toward other people, he said.

U.S. Reaction to Soviet Initiative Viewed

*AU2405120589 East Berlin NEUES DEUTSCHLAND
in German 19 May 89 p 2*

[“W.M.” commentary: “Agreement and Phrases”]

[Text] The new Soviet initiative on disarmament in Europe is being met with great approval from all over the world. The announcement of the unilateral withdrawal of 500 warheads of tactical nuclear weapons and the offers to reduce the armed forces and conventional armaments on both sides to a large extent and to withdraw all nuclear ammunition from the territory of the allies of the USSR and the United States are further proof of the determination of socialism to do everything

for the continuation of the disarmament process. People in east and west, north and south should be able to live in security, and without having to worry about a devastating military conflict.

All those who want a more secure peace have interpreted the Soviet initiative in exactly this way. In view of the unanimous echo, the Western capitals also welcomed it as a step in the right direction. However, it was immediately stated in Washington that negotiations on tactical nuclear weapons are still not desired. And Bonn assisted by rejecting a third zero solution. Nor did the NATO secretary general propose anything more sensible either.

"It is a pitiful sight which our Western alliance is presenting from the political point of view at the moment," the FRANKFURTER RUNDSCHAU commented on this foolish reaction. It is not enough to only talk of steps in the right direction all the time and to do nothing, it was stated. Even BILD turned against the U.S. President in its headline: "Now It Is Your Turn, Mr Bush!"

Indeed. Now Washington and NATO have to take action at last. Disarmament cannot work if one party always makes new offers, while the other can only offer slogans and carries on rearming. The moment of truth came a while ago, although people in the Brussels NATO Headquarters apparently do not understand this. He who is stalling about the most important question of our time—which is how securing peace is understood everywhere on our continent—needs not be surprised if a dog will not take a piece of bread from him.

Although U.S. Secretary of State Baker was the first person to whom the Soviet initiative was explained in Moscow, he thought he could discredit it by calling it "apparently intended for the public." Yes, but for whom else? For whom are the missiles in the FRG, which Washington wants to "modernize" in all events, intended? The public, that is, people who are represented in their basic vital interests by peace initiatives of socialism but who feel increasingly threatened by NATO's fanatical clinging to the hellish devices. This may not please some politicians in the West—yet it is a fact.

HUNGARY

Foreign Ministry Official on Soviet Proposals to Baker

AU2305204589 Budapest NEPSZABADSAG
in Hungarian 13 May 89 p 2

[Interview with Bela Kupper, head of a main department of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, by S.P. on 12 May; place not given: "How Do the New Proposals Affect Hungary?—An Expert Who Participated in Shevardnadze's Warsaw Pact Briefing Gave an Interview to NEPSZABADSAG"]

[Text] Soviet Foreign Minister Eduard Shevardnadze informed the foreign ministers of the Warsaw Pact states about the new Soviet disarmament proposals and his

talks with U.S. Secretary of State James Baker in Moscow. At this briefing held in Moscow on 12 May, Hungary was represented by Deputy Foreign Minister Gabor Nagy. He was accompanied by Bela Kupper who gave an interview to our correspondent.

[S.P.] Could you tell us something about the talks with Baker?

[Kupper] It has become a practice for the new Soviet leadership to directly inform its allies immediately after Soviet-U.S. talks, and this shows that the Soviet side regards its allies as equal partners and considers it important to share its experiences with them. The same thing has occurred this time, too.

As for the substance of the talks, we can welcome the fact that there were no confrontational elements in the Soviet-U.S. talks. One can notice an advance from confrontation toward cooperation. This also applies to humanitarian issues, and this is a welcome development. We were also informed that the new U.S. Administration was showing increased readiness to settle area crises; in this respect, one can also count on mutual and parallel initiatives. The talks also focused on Soviet domestic development and on the issue of restructuring in the socialist countries in general. In connection with President Bush's planned visit to Hungary, on behalf of the Soviet leadership, Foreign Minister Shevardnadze confirmed that they welcomed and supported these contacts.

At this first of a series of negotiations with the secretary of state of the new U.S. Administration, the two sides mutually committed themselves to continue a practice according to the principles developed at the highest level and to advance. This gives hope to all of us.

[S.P.] Has this round of Soviet-U.S. negotiations brought about a breakthrough?

[Kupper] No, it has not, nor could one now expect an agreement on issues that were not agreed upon with the previous administration: The 50-percent reduction of tactical offensive weapons and the elimination of space armament. However, the Soviet side tied very serious new steps to these negotiations, and not only proposals but also unilateral measures of equal effect.

[S.P.] The proposals connected with the tactical nuclear missiles have already caused a great reaction.

[Kupper] In Budapest in 1986, the Warsaw Pact countries initiated a radical reduction of conventional forces in Europe, and their proposal also covered the tactical nuclear weapons. However, the mandate of the current Vienna negotiations of the 23 Warsaw Pact and NATO countries does not cover the latter, and therefore, the socialist countries proposed to deal with these tactical nuclear weapons in the framework of separate negotiations. Thus, we do not connect the future negotiations on tactical nuclear weapons in Europe with the current

Vienna negotiations on conventional forces and armaments, but we regard those negotiations as essential because the importance of nuclear weapons is increasing in European military policy today precisely due to the reduction in conventional arms.

[S.P.] Gorbachev made his proposal shortly before the NATO summit scheduled for the end of May.

[Kupper] We heard that the NATO summit would deal with the subject of tactical nuclear weapons and that there were serious considerations to develop these weapons, something that would contradict the processes currently prevailing in Europe. Several NATO members openly voice their reservations in this respect. Naturally, Gorbachev's proposal could have an effect on this debate. The Soviet Union has again demonstrated that it is serious about disarmament and it also takes unilateral steps and radically proposes the third zero option (following the agreement on intermediate- and short-range missiles)—namely, to free Europe of all Soviet and U.S. nuclear weapons by the end of 1991.

[S.P.] To what extent will this affect us Hungarians?

[Kupper] The Soviet troops stationed in Hungary have so-called double-purpose carrier and target missiles (which can carry both conventional and nuclear warheads), but there are no nuclear warheads on Hungarian territory. In other words, such carrier and target missiles can be withdrawn from Hungary, but nuclear warheads cannot be withdrawn because there are no such warheads here. However, one must add that, in the case of a conflict, which we want to avoid by all means, we could also become the target of such weapons, and therefore, Hungarian diplomacy is strongly in favor of eliminating such weapons. Besides, this is in harmony with the experience of the conventional disarmament talks in Vienna—namely, that Hungary is situated in the central European tactical zone, and, thus, the first stage of reductions will also affect us.

NATO's Woerner Interviewed on Military Doctrine

*LD1505223589 Budapest MTI in English
2017 GMT 15 May 89*

[Text] Budapest, May 15 (MTI)—NATO General Secretary Manfred Woerner discussed the missile modernization programme that currently divides NATO, and the organization's military doctrine, in an interview with Hungarian television's foreign affairs programme "Panorama", which aired on Monday evening.

Mr Woerner said he holds it his personal task to promote that a compromise is reached in the affair of missile modernization, however, he cannot at present discuss the solution. He stressed: In the interest of protecting its interests, NATO should, on the one hand, safeguard the efficiency of its defence, on the other hand, NATO does

not reject negotiations. Opportunities exist to overcome the differences in views between the member countries, as we have always done in the past, Mr Woerner said.

Discussing the military doctrine of NATO and the new policy of the Soviet Union, Mr Woerner noted: The military doctrine of NATO has never had an attacking nature, NATO has always maintained smaller armed forces than the Soviet Union. The statistics of the Warsaw Treaty also justify this. Why then should the doctrine be changed now, Mr Woerner asked? He then added: The Soviet Union is beginning to reduce its prevalent military potential, a step that we welcome. At the same time, NATO unilaterally eliminated 2,400 nuclear weapons. Our goal continues to be to hold the level of weapons on an identical, low level on both sides. There is a basic principle: One who has more has to cut back more. At present, the Soviet Union has considerably more weapons, thus it has to eliminate more as well.

With respect to the modernization of short-range nuclear missiles, I should first like to note: Hungary need not fear NATO, and the Hungarians are aware of this. The threats to Hungary have not started from NATO, or the West to date. It is not necessary for me to be more clear on this subject, the general secretary added. The Soviet Union has 16 times more short-range nuclear weapons than NATO, and it has just completed the modernization of its nuclear weapons. Why would it then be bad for the West to do the same as the Soviet Union? Incidentally, Mr Woerner continued, political and economic relations between the eastern and western parts of Europe show a powerful development. If political tensions are successfully eased, or eliminated, then the armed forces lose their earlier significance, and this will have a positive effect also on the role of the military alliances. Although the weapons will be more modern, they will number less. We believe this is the aim of the Soviet Union and the Warsaw Treaty as well, Mr Woerner said.

Soviet Troop, Materiel Withdrawal Continues

Tank Unit Departs

*LD1905181489 Budapest Domestic Service
in Hungarian 1630 GMT 19 May 89*

[Text] [Presenter] When the Soviet troop withdrawal began a few weeks ago in Kiskunhalas, even U.S. television companies attended the event. I do not know who reported on today's troop withdrawal in Sarbogard. However, what is certain is that Gyula Horvath represented "Evening Magazine" there.

[Horvath] There was a farewell ceremony, with music, in Sarbogard today for the 141st Soviet Tank Regiment, which will be disbanded after it returns home, thereby leaving fewer soldiers in our country, and thus in Europe, as well. The Hungarian and international press, as well as the foreign military attaches were present at the festive meeting of the force.

Colonel (Boris Adamenko), deputy chief of staff of the Southern Army Group, emphasized that in the spirit of the defensive doctrine, a zone of confidence 100-km wide was being formed in Hungary, and for this reason troops were being transferred from the western part of Transdanubia to the center of the country. Thus, artillerymen from the western border are moving into the now-vacated tank crew barracks.

This year, 10,000 Soviet soldiers are being withdrawn from Hungary. After Kiskunhalas, the tank operators have now left Sarbogard. There were 54 T-64 tanks, along with their 600-strong crew.

Soviet Armored Regiment Leaves

*LD1905222689 Budapest Domestic Service
in Hungarian 2000 GMT 19 May 89*

[Excerpts] More Soviet armored troops have left Hungary for home. [passage omitted]

From Debrecen, an armored training regiment set off. Both armored regiments will be dissolved, but neither Hungarian nor Soviet barracks will remain empty because soldiers will be transferred from western Transdanubia. This year 15,000 [as heard] Soviet soldiers, 450 tanks, 300 artillery, and trench mortars, and several thousand motor vehicles will leave Hungary.

POLAND

Jaruzelski Chairs Defense Committee Meeting on Defense Doctrine, CFE

*LD2105212489 Warsaw PAP in English
1751 GMT 21 May 89*

[Text] Warsaw, May 21—A session of the National Defence Committee (KOK), chaired by Gen. Wojciech Jaruzelski, was held today.

The National Defence Committee set directions of further work on amending Poland's defensive doctrine, acquainted itself with the outcome and sized up prospects of the Vienna talks on disarmament and the reduction of armed forces in Europe.

The committee voiced support for Soviet disarmament initiatives. At the same time, it said with satisfaction that the intentions and contents of the Jaruzelski Plan were increasingly clearly reflected on these talks.

The committee examined the impact of detente process on restructuring Polish armed forces, pursued already regularly under a discussion announced by the National Defence Committee on November 21, 1988.

The committee sized up also the current situation as regards domestic security. It condemned adventurist excesses and analyzed existing threats. It pointed to a dependence of the state of security on the observance of legal order, respect for the supreme interests of the

nation and state by all social and political forces and the public. The National Defence Committee voiced hope that the understanding of this necessity would become universal.

The following officials took part in the session: KOK's first deputy chairman, Prime Minister Mieczyslaw F. Rakowski, KOK's deputy chairmen: Chairman of the United Peasant Party CC Roman Malinowski, Chairman of the Democratic Party CC Jerzy Jozwiak and National Defence Minister Gen. Florian Siwicki as well as KOK's members: Interior Minister Gen. Czeslaw Kiszcak, Foreign Minister Tadeusz Olechowski and the remaining members of the committee.

ROMANIA

Foreign Ministry Conveys Pact Appeal to NATO

*AU2205170889 Bucharest AGERPRES in English
1548 GMT 22 May 89*

[“On the Necessity To Intensify Political Dialogue”—AGERPRES headline]

[Text] Bucharest, AGERPRES, 22/05/1989—According to the understanding covenanted among the Warsaw Treaty participating states, on 22 May, the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the Socialist Republic of Romania conveyed the diplomatic representatives of the NATO member states—Belgium, Canada, Denmark, France, the Federal Republic of Germany, Great Britain, the Hellenic Republic, Iceland, Italy, Luxembourg, the Netherlands, Norway, the Portuguese Republic, Spain, Turkey, the United States of America—the appeal of the Warsaw Treaty participating states to the North Atlantic alliance member states.

The appeal urges to stepped-up efforts to halt the arms race and achieve disarmament, nuclear disarmament first and foremost, eliminate all weapons of mass destruction, substantially cut on armed forces, conventional armaments and military spendings, to overcome Europe's division, build up confidence and deepen interstate collaboration, ensure a dynamic development and general prosperity in conditions of independence, stability and peace on the continent and throughout the world.

The Warsaw Treaty participating states' proposal is reasserted regarding the organization of separate negotiations with NATO member countries on the tactical nuclear armament. At the same time, stress is laid on the necessity that no step be made which could complicate the negotiation process and give a new impetus to the arms race, even under the pretext of its modernization.

Commentary Supports 'Denuclearization' of Europe
*AU1705144989 Bucharest SCINTEIA in Romanian
13 May 89 p 6*

[Romulus Caplescu article: "Who is Afraid of Denuclearization or the Implications of the Interatlantic Crisis"]

[Excerpts] While a tremendous majority of the people on earth and all progressive minds on our planet rise to defend the supreme right to life and peace for each human being, in the belief—with good reason—that there cannot be a more pressing requirement than eliminating nuclear weapons, primarily from Europe where the largest part of such weapons is concentrated, the prospect of denuclearization is a downright nightmare for those who are captivated by such military doctrines as nuclear deterrence. It is more than paradoxical, it is a situation verging outright on the absurd, that illustrates where such a way of thinking can lead according to which the preservation of the most terrifying weapons ever known to history would be the only genuine guarantee for peace.

In his speech delivered yesterday [12 May] at the big mass rally in Drobeta-Turnu Severin Municipality, Comrade Nicolae Ceausescu, recalling some steps taken toward diminishing the nuclear threat, that is the conclusion of the Soviet-American accord on the elimination of intermediate-range missiles—which represent, however, a very small percentage of the total of nuclear weapons since huge stocks will continue to exist, thus being capable to destroy all humanity several times over—justifiably emphasized that after these initial steps things were expected to make headway. "Unfortunately," the speaker said, "it seems that some people, afraid of the prospect of disarmament, of the losses of profits from an armament policy, and of the possibilities offered by a policy of nuclear blackmail and of force and dictate, have actually begun to back out."

As is known, everything started from the West German Government position that favors a postponement of the planned modernization of short-range or tactical missiles deployed in the FRG, and that accepts the proposal of the Warsaw Pact member countries to immediately organize negotiations on reducing all tactical missiles deployed in Europe to ever lower parity levels up to their complete elimination. [passage omitted]

In their position, the authorities in Bonn certainly were bearing in mind the prevailing public opinion trend in the country, which is constantly on the increase. [passage omitted]

At this point, numerous military people in the Bundeswehr leadership are convinced that the weapons deployed in Europe have become void of significance from a military viewpoint, namely that they would not

be able to guarantee a final victory for either side should there be a conflict, while for the civilian population they obviously pose a tremendous threat. [passage omitted]

Regardless of their motives, the decision made by Bonn has greatly alarmed Washington and London, which have categorically rejected any negotiations on tactical nuclear weapons, and the possibility of denuclearizing the European Continent. There have been warnings that the denuclearization of the continent would be "a disaster" for the Atlantic pact, that "no one should assume the right to adopt unilateral decisions that affect NATO's nuclear strategy," that the "triple zero option" would be a trap, and that the idea of negotiations on tactical missiles "should not be accepted by any means." [passage omitted]

People are more and more aware of the baneful nature of the reactionary mentalities, which bank on the nuclear factor by ignoring the elementary truth that, far from strengthening security, weapons of any kind, but primarily nuclear weapons to which the nostalgists of the bloc policy cling, undermine security to the greatest extent. The latest interatlantic developments prove, above all, the anachronistic nature of military blocs, which are a direct result of such a mentality, they are vestiges of the cold war, and thus are inevitably doomed to failure.

Public Groups Appeal to NATO Counterparts on SNF

Appeals Delivered to Embassies
*AU2205195089 Bucharest AGERPRES in English
1924 GMT 22 May 89*

[("Appeals for the Renunciation of the Updating of Nuclear Weapons by NATO States"—AGERPRES headline]

[Text] Bucharest, AGERPRES, 22/05/1989—As an expression of the whole Romanian people's will to live in a world of peace, friendship and collaboration, the mass and public organizations in Romania sent the governments and similar organizations in NATO countries appeals whereby they urge them to do everything possible for those states to renounce the development of tactical nuclear weapons and any measures intended to stimulate the arms race.

On Monday, May 22, the appeals of the Central Council of the General Trade Union Confederation of Romania, of the National Council of Working People, of the National Peace Committee, of the Romanian Orthodox Church, of the National Women's Council, of the Central Committee of the Union of Communist Youth, of the Council of the Union of Communist Students' Associations of Romania, of the National Council of the Young Pioneers Organization, of the Roman Catholic Church, of the National Union of Producer Cooperative Farms, of the Armenian Gregorian Church and of the Socialist Democracy and Union Organization were

handed over to the headquarters of the embassies of the Federal Republic of Germany, the United States of America, Canada and Great Britain in Bucharest.

Trade Unions, Church Statements
*AU2305164289 Bucharest AGERPRES in English
1331 GMT 23 May 89*

[“The Romanian People Speaks Against Nuclear Arms Modernization”]

[Text] Bucharest, AGERPRES, 23/5/1989—Romania's policy of peace and broad international collaboration tellingly proved by President Nicolae Ceausescu's initiatives and actions meant to deepen and dynamize the process of disarmament, confidence-building and detente in Europe and the world over is fully approved and steadfastly backed by the Romanian people and finds a vivid and legitimate echo in the consciousness of world nations.

According to the RCP [Romanian Communist Party] and the Romanian state, progress, the flourishing of civilization, the ensurance of a bright future are not possible in the absence of a durable peace, a climate of true interstate confidence, a wide and fruitful international collaboration. In these circumstances, the recent decision of the NATO member countries to discuss, at the forthcoming summit of 29 May, the passage to the modernization of short-range nuclear missiles is a great worry, an initiative which would seriously prejudice the incipient disarmament process. The modernization of this class of missiles would annul the results scored so far along the way of nuclear disarmament, replacing a force of destruction with a more sophisticated and dangerous one, the essence of such a modernization being the reactivation of the arms race and its growing technologic improvement.

Consistent with its policy of peace, promotion of disarmament and detente in fact, Romania states firmly against such an initiative in utter disagreement with the vital interests of all peoples, supporting the imperious necessity of starting negotiations for the conclusion of an accord to cut nuclear strategic arms by 50 percent and completely eliminate all nuclear arms by the year 2000.

As an expression of the whole Romanian people's will to live in a world of peace, friendship and collaboration, the mass and public organizations in Romania sent the governments and similar organizations in NATO countries appeals whereby they urge them to do everything possible for those states to renounce the development of tactical nuclear weapons and any measures intended to stimulate the arms race.

On Monday, May 22, the appeals of the Central Council of the General Trade Union Confederation of Romania, of the National Council of Working People, of the National Peace Committee, of the Romanian Orthodox

Church, of the National Women's Council, of the Central Committee of the Union of Communist Youth, of the Council of the Union of Communist Students' Associations of Romania, of the National Council of the Young Pioneers Organization, of the Roman Catholic Church, of the National Union of Producer Cooperative Farms, of the Armenian Gregorian Church and of the Socialist Democracy and Union Organization were handed over to the Headquarters of the Embassies of the Federal Republic of Germany, the United States of America, Canada and Great Britain in Bucharest.

The appeal of the General Trade Union Confederation of Romania shows inter alia:

The millions of working people, trade union members in Romania, our whole people, deeply worried about the grave situation created, declare firmly against the NATO plans and programs of tactical weapons and short-range missiles updating and development, against any measure conducive to the intensification of nuclear arming, of any kind of arming, to endangering mankind's existence. They firmly support Romania's initiatives, President Nicolae Ceausescu's demarches and constant efforts for the achievement of an accord on 50 percent reduction of the strategic nuclear weapons, for averting the space militarization, for the cessation of all nuclear tests, the complete elimination by 2000 of all nuclear weapons, the liquidation of the other mass destruction weapons, the drastic reduction of the conventional weapons.

The trade unions, the working people in Romania, in full harmony with our whole people's aspirations after peace, call on your country's government to understand the gravity of the nuclear arming escalation and act responsibly toward the future of the peoples, abstaining from any measure of tactical weapon and short-range missile modernization, to speak up for the participation in negotiations conducive to the elimination of these weapons, to join resolutely in the efforts toward the definitive elimination of all mass destruction weapons and contribute to the building of a world of peace and collaboration, based on full equality among all nations of the world.

The appeal of the National Council of Working People of the Socialist Republic of Romania points out: The working people in our country are concerned about the forthcoming NATO session being to discuss the passage to the modernization of the short-range nuclear missiles. We are fully confident that, if this decision were applied, the nuclear arms race would know unprecedented intensification, completely annulling the effects of the reduction of the medium-range weapons and passing on to additional increase of the nuclear power as compared to that in existence before the conclusion of the Soviet-American accord.

We ardently urge all governments of the NATO countries to work together with the peace-loving forces in their own countries, in Europe and all over to the world,

to make decisions that should not lead to the modernization and development of the short-range nuclear weapons and to firmly campaign for the beginning of negotiations toward their definitive elimination, toward concluding an accord on some 50 per cent reduction of the strategic nuclear weapons and the complete elimination by 2000 of all nuclear weapons.

The appeal highlights that the whole Romanian people reiterates its determination to increase its actions together with the democratic, progressive, realistically-minded forces all over the world to bar the way to intensifying the nuclear arming through the modernization of weapons, to reduce military expenditures and use the thus released funds to the benefit of every nation's progress and prosperity.

The appeal of the National Peace Committee expresses the confidence that the lofty mission of all states, especially of the countries in Europe and north America, the most heavily armed regions of the world, is to work against the danger of confrontation and war, for detente and international understanding, for peace.

The National Peace Committee in Romania urges the governments of the NATO member countries to do their utmost for the renunciation of the plans of short-range missile modernization, to contribute to the starting of multilateral negotiations on the complete elimination of the nuclear arsenals by 2000.

The appeal of the National Women's Council highlights the deep worry of the millions of women in Romania about the NATO countries' intention to discuss at the end of this month the passage to the modernization and development of the short-range nuclear missiles, stressing that it is necessary, in the interests of the triumph of reason, of all European peoples' ideals of peace and security, that any action of modernization of these categories of nuclear missiles be given up.

We call on you to make every effort for disarmament, nuclear above all, by saying a resolute no to the modernization of the short-range nuclear missiles, to most firmly work for the complete elimination of the nuclear, chemical weapons, for a radical reduction of the conventional weapons and military expenditures.

The appeal of the Central Committee of the Union of Communist Youth, the Council of the Union of Communist Student Associations of Romania and the National Council of the Young Pioneers' Organization urges the NATO member states to put an end to the plans of short-range nuclear missile modernization, to avoid any measure that might entail serious prejudice for the process of building an atmosphere of confidence world-wide.

We also invite our fellow young people all over the world, all peoples, political factors, to say together, in the name of our future, a resolute no to the nuclear and

chemical weapons, to the arms race, and to work with all forces for the building of a world of peace, international understanding and cooperation, the appeal shows.

The appeal of the Romanian Orthodox Church stresses:

The Romanian Orthodox Church has always raised its voice when life itself was threatened by adversities of fate. Therefore today, when mankind's survival is on the threshold of new threats, the hierarchs, the clergy and orthodox faithfuls in Romania join our whole people in which we have our origin and from which we derive our faith, and invite your governments and peoples to be in this crucial circumstance up to the burning requirements of the European peoples, of all peoples, to free themselves from the ghost of nuclear destruction and dedicate their creative energies to the building of a peaceful and happy life in all continents of the planet.

As citizens of a peace-loving country that has made of the defence of peace a real creed, we wholeheartedly sustain the ardent appeals of our distinguished President Mr Nicolae Ceausescu, that the NATO plans of modernization of the tactical weapons and short-range nuclear missiles be given up, that the insane arms race generally be curbed, that action be firmly taken for the complete elimination of all nuclear weapons.

The appeal of the Roman-Catholic Church in Romania reads:

Together with the whole Romanian people, the faithfuls, priests, bishops and the other servants of the Roman-Catholic Church in Romania have learned with worry that the heads of state and government of the NATO countries planned to discuss the question of modernizing the tactical weapons and the short-range nuclear missiles.

Relying upon our oath of faith, upon our full unity of thought and feeling of all Roman-Catholic faithfuls in Europe and in the world, we are sure that the application of the NATO plans will endanger our peoples' collaboration, life and civilization. Therefore, we address our ardent appeal to all political and military leaders in the NATO countries to renounce the application of the modernization of the tactical weapons and of the short-range missiles.

The appeal of the Armenian-Gregorian Church shows that the NATO plan to modernize the short-range nuclear missiles results in curbing the process of detente, worsening the international situation, in new dangers that threaten mankind's peaceful work, life itself on earth.

The Armenian clergy and faithfuls in Romania, the appeal further shows, as sons of a peace-loving country, sustain the conception and stands expressed on various

occasions by Mr Nicolae Ceausescu, our country's president, for persevering action to be taken toward the beginning of negotiations on the definitive elimination of these weapons, as this is the only reasonable solution for mankind's survival.

We warmly urge you to do everything possible for an end to be put to the actions of modernization of the tactical weapons and of the short-range missiles, for the halting of the arms race, for the reduction of the weapons and military expenditures, for ensuring a climate of peace and security for the whole of mankind.

More Appeals To Halt Plans
*AU2305194189 Bucharest AGERPRES in English
1822 GMT 23 May 89*

[**"Appeals for the Renunciation of the Updating of Nuclear Weapons by NATO Countries"—AGERPRES headline**]

[Text] Bucharest, AGERPRES, 23/05/1989—On May 23, at the headquarters of the Embassies of Italy, the Netherlands, Greece, the Federal Republic of Germany and Spain in Bucharest the appeals to the governments and the public organizations of the respective countries for the renunciation by NATO countries of the modernization of short-range nuclear missiles were handed over on behalf of the Romanian National Committee "Scientists and Peace", the Foreign Policy and International Economic Cooperation Commission and the Defence Commission of the Grand National Assembly, the National Council of the Red Cross Society, the National Council of Agriculture, the Food Industry, Silviculture and Water Management, the General Union of Handicraft Cooperatives, the Central Union of Producer Cooperative Farms, of Acquisition and Sales of Commodities, the Writers' Union, the Architects' Union, the Union of Scientific Associations of the Teaching Staff, the Union of Medical Sciences Associations, the Romanian Committee of Former Fighters and Veterans of the War Against Fascism, the National Council for Physical Education and Sport, the Jurists' Association, the Journalists' Council, as well as several denominations in Romania.

The same day handing over appeals at the headquarters of the embassies of other NATO countries—Turkey, France, the Netherlands, Italy, Spain, Greece—were the delegations of the Central Council of the General Trade Union Confederation of Romania, the National Council of Working People, the National Peace Committee, the National Women's Council, the Central Committee of the Union of Communist Youth, the Council of the Union of Communist Student Associations of Romania, the National Council of the Young Pioneers Organization, the Romanian Orthodox Church, the National Union of Producer Cooperative Farms, the Roman Catholic Church of Romania, the Socialist Democracy and Unity Organization, the Armenian Gregorian Church of Romania.

SCINTEIA Editorial Urges Halt to SNF Modernization

*AU2405111889 Bucharest AGERPRES in English
1024 GMT 24 May 89*

[**"Excerpts of Commentary in the Daily SCINTEIA of 24 May: 'For the Halting of Nuclear Arms Modernization Actions'"**]

[Text] Bucharest, AGERPRES 24/5/1989—President Nicolae Ceausescu pointed out in his speeches lately and in declarations made at the recent meeting of the Executive Political Committee of the CC [Central Committee] of the RCP [Romanian Communist Party], the dangers entailed by the actions of reactivation of the nuclear arms race, especially by the NATO plans for the so-called modernization of the short-range tactical nuclear missiles. The Romanian president cautioned more than once about the euphoria induced by certain steps taken toward disarmament. Or, the fact is that, after the removal of the medium-range missiles under the accord signed in this connection, the world arsenals of nuclear missiles still retain tremendous amounts of weapons—over 95 percent—which keep practically unchanged what the experts term "the overkilling capacity," meaning the capacity to destroy the whole of mankind several times over, to destroy the very conditions of life on our planet. Under the circumstances, the peoples were entitled to hope for and expect progress toward the diminution of the arsenals in existence.

Unfortunately, as President Nicolae Ceausescu showed at the big civic rally in Drobeta-Turnu Severin, "it seems that some have got frightened by the prospect of disarmament, of loss of profits from the policy of arming, but also of possibilities to promote the policy of nuclear blackmail, the policy of strength and dictate and they have actually started to draw back."

There is no other way for mankind's survival than the complete liquidation of the nuclear combat means, of the chemical weapons, of other mass destruction weapons, the radical reduction of the conventional weapons, the renunciation of the policy of outer space militarization. Disarmament is today a vital requisite of the whole of mankind's future and life. In consideration of this requirement, Romania's president expressed the whole Romanian people's thoughts and aspirations, urged all peoples in Europe, all political forces, governments, heads of state to say a resolute no to nuclear and chemical weapons, to work for ensuring the peaceful future of mankind.

Expressing their unanimous adhesion to this enthusing appeal, a large number of mass and public organizations, representing the broadest categories of working people in Romania, address in turn these days to governments and similar organizations in the NATO member countries appeals voicing their worry about the plans of modernization of the tactical nuclear weapons and demand that everything possible be done for those plans and any

measure meant to stimulate the arming spiral to be given up. The appeals stress on good reason that the modernization of those missiles would annual the results scored so far on the road to nuclear disarmament, replacing one destructive power by another, more sophisticated and dangerous one, would entail unforeseeable consequences on a European and world plane.

The tendency of some of the Atlantic circles to stick at any cost to "nuclear deterrence" or to the outlook of "flexible retaliation" which means the use of nuclear weapons in certain circumstances, is in utter contradiction with the fundamental interests of peace, with the requirements of the peoples, of public opinion for the definitive renunciation of the nuclear missiles, irrespective of their range.

That is why, on reiterating at the Executive Political Committee meeting Romania's firm stand against the modernization of the short-range nuclear missiles, President Nicolae Ceausescu stressed the need for the NATO to give up any decision and measure toward the modernization of these weapons. Romania thinks that resolute action must be taken for the beginning of negotiations on eliminating them for good.

Firmly sustaining this desideratum, the necessity of complete removal of all nuclear weapons by 2000, Romania's mass and public organizations reiterate a fundamental option of the Romanian people. The appeals of these days, that add to the great and widely reverberated actions of past years, are one more proof of the steadiness in which Romania's citizens mean to work in support of the great imperative of disarmament and peace.

Fitting in this line is also the appeal of the Warsaw Treaty participant states to the North Atlantic Treaty Organization states, conveyed by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Romania to the latter's diplomatic representatives. On the eve of its summit session, the NATO is urged to intensify the efforts, the political dialogue for the halting of the arms race and the achievement of disarmament, nuclear above all, for the elimination of all mass destruction weapons and the substantive reduction of the armed forces and conventional weapons, as well as of the military expenditures, for overcoming Europe's division, through the concomitant abolition of the two political-military alliances, for the consolidation of confidence and the deepening of the collaboration among states.

It is more necessary than ever now that abstention and lucid-mindedness be shown, that nothing be spared in order to have reason, sound judgement prevail in view of achieving wide-embracing accords and understanding, up to the peoples' expectations.

YUGOSLAVIA

Ambassador Pejic Assesses Role of UN Disarmament Commission

AU1005085789 Belgrade TANJUG in English
0202 GMT 10 May 89

[“Pool” item]

[Text] United Nations, May 9 (TANJUG)—Yugoslavia attaches great importance to the strengthening of the role of the United Nations in the disarmament process, convinced that the world organization is irreplaceable for the settlement of important international problems, Yugoslav representative in the United Nations Ambassador Dragoslav Pejic said today, taking part in the work of the U.N. Commission for Disarmament.

The lack of concrete results in the field of disarmament on a multilateral level is not caused by the ineffectiveness of such mechanisms but by the political aspects of the problem, Pejic said.

The commission, made up of all United Nations member countries, is to state its stand on concrete proposals for the settlement of this important question by the end of this month.

Assessing that the commission is working in extremely favourable circumstances, dictated by the success of the Vienna negotiations, the Paris conference on disarmament of chemical weapons and the two super powers' dialogue, Pejic expressed Yugoslavia's concern that no progress has been made concerning a comprehensive ban on nuclear tests.

"As a European and a Mediterranean country, Yugoslavia attaches special importance to stopping the arms race in naval weapons," Pejic said.

Greater security in the Mediterranean and other seas, as the majority of the Non-aligned Movement documents stress, can be achieved only by the withdrawal of foreign military powers from the region, Pejic said.

BRAZIL

Prototype VLS Space Rocket Launched *PY1805231389 Brasilia Domestic Service in Portuguese 2200 GMT 18 May 89*

[Text] The launch of the prototype of the Satellite Launching Vehicle, VLS-2, took place at the Barrera do Inferno launch center today after a 2-day delay.

This launch represents a crucial test of the Brazilian space program, because it will allow Brazil to launch its own satellites.

The first mission of the VLS will be carried out in 1992 at Alcantara, Maranhao State.

Avibras, PRC To Sell Satellite Launchers *33420050a Sao Paulo FOLHA DE SAO PAULO in Portuguese 19 Apr 89 p A-8*

[Article by Roberto Lopes]

[Text] The Avibras International Company of London—a subsidiary of Sao Paulo's Avibras Aerospace Corporation, the country's chief arms exporter—signed a contract with the Chinese Government 2 weeks ago to set up an agency which, operating like a trading company, will market launchings of space rockets and supply satellite tracking equipment to Third World countries. The new company will be called International Satellite Communication (Inscom). The signing of the agreement, which took place in Beijing on 4 April, was the result of almost 3 years of negotiations between the Brazilian firm and the China Great Wall Industry Corporation—the industrial arm of the Chinese Ministry of Astronautics.

President Jose Sarney and Minister of Army Leonidas Pires Goncalves were informed of the talks about a year ago—even before Sarney's official visit to China (in July 1988). Except for them, only Ambassador Paulo Tarso Flecha de Lima, secretary general of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, was kept informed of the details of the plan. The government respected the secrecy surrounding the negotiations. Today, in addition to Sarney, Leonidas, and Paulo de Tarso, only four other ministers—General Ivan de Souza Mendes, chief of the SNI [National Intelligence Service]; General Octavio Moreira Lima, minister of aeronautics; General Rubens Bayma Denys, chief of the Military Household of the Presidency; and Abreu Sodre, minister of foreign affairs—are familiar with the matter.

The secrecy is justified. In the Middle East alone, the immediate potential market for supplying space centers and launching artificial satellites is estimated by the Chinese at DM1 billion (\$600 million)—that is, 13 times the value of Brazil's share of the scientific cooperation program with China for building two artificial satellites. The partnership between Avibras and Great Wall will be

announced officially within 2 months—during the upcoming International Air Show at Le Bourget in Paris in the presence of government officials from Brazil and China.

News of the deal did not leak out until 3 weeks ago, when two executives from the Brazilian firm Elebra (one of them a colonel in the Air Force Reserve named Mendonca) intercepted a mission from the Chinese Ministry of Astronautics that was making a courtesy visit to Minister Moreira Lima in Brasilia. FOLHA DE SAO PAULO has learned that the Brazilian pair proposed to the Chinese that a partnership be formed for space launches and the joint development of new rocket projects. The Chinese listened attentively and smiled, and then one of them, U Keli, revealed that China was already involved in similar negotiations with Brazil's Avibras. U Keli, who is Great Wall's vice president for space affairs, is also the number two man in Inscom.

Great Wall's partnership with Avibras differs from the one proposed by Elebra in that Inscom will not concern itself with developing new rockets for its customers, much less with any military objectives in connection with its work (something which the Chinese felt was implied in Elebra's intentions). Avibras and the governments of China and Brazil are well aware of the diplomatic difficulties with the big Western powers that they would have to face if the United States discovered that Inscom was going to sell rockets to Third World countries or that its contracts to supply space centers in the Middle East, Latin America, Asia, or Africa were going to be used for military projects on those continents.

The day before yesterday, late in the afternoon, Avibras Director of Government Relations and Sales Manager Pedro Vial—who will be a kind of manager for Inscom in Brazil—reacted with surprise and great nervousness as he talked to reporters who had gone to the firm's headquarters in the municipality of Sao Jose dos Campos (85 km from Sao Paulo). "The Inscom matter will be announced to the press by the company chairman, Joao Verdi Leite (chairman of Avibras), in Paris in June. Until then, FOLHA DE SAO PAULO will just have to wait," he said at first.

Despite that, Vial could not prevent our newspaper from interviewing two Great Wall executives who were at Avibras over the last holiday preparing the proposal which they will submit to the Ministry of Communications this morning in an attempt to win the contract for launching the satellites included in the Brasilsat-2 program. One of the Chinese, Fu Wen Long, will be a member of the Inscom board of directors. His companion, Chen Shouchun, Great Wall's vice president for science and technology, said that he saw "better prospects for Inscom in South America, the Middle East, and Asia. We are very happy with the new firm," he said in conclusion, and he never stopped smiling.

Capital of \$500,000

Inscom, the company formed by the Sao Paulo firm of Avibras and the Chinese Government to launch satellites for Third World countries and supply them with tracking stations, will have its headquarters in Europe and branch offices in Sao Jose dos Campos (at Avibras headquarters) and in Beijing (where Great Wall's main offices are located). The company's initial capital will total \$500,000 (about 1 million new cruzados), most of which will be supplied by the Brazilian firm.

Last December, Pedro Vial was in China negotiating that and other final details in connection with the undertaking. The day before yesterday, he would say only that the new company was going to be physically located on the top floor of the so-called VIP wing at Avibras, near the landing strip used by Embraer [Brazilian Aeronautics Company]. Avibras is experiencing a financial crisis. At the end of last year, after the Iraqi Government delayed payment on military rocket launchers of the Astros-2 type—the star performer in Avibras sales in recent years—the firm laid off over 1,000 employees and began paying the remaining 5,000 employees late.

"We had a cash-flow problem which we have not concealed from anyone, including our Chinese partners in Inscom. They know everything. Since our difficulties are due to circumstances of the moment and are temporary, we did not want to interrupt the firm's growth and the project with China. Next week we will begin paying the amounts due those who were laid off but have not yet received everything to which they are entitled. We will also try to straighten out our monthly payments. In other words, we will begin overcoming our difficulties. Today we are convinced that we did the right thing by not suspending the negotiations on Inscom because of our cash-flow problems," said Vial.

In fact, the military and financial areas of the government have always had faith in Avibras' ability to overcome its economic difficulties. A general assigned to Army Headquarters in Brasilia told FOLHA DE SAO PAULO early this month that the yards at one of the company's plants are full of rockets for the Astros-2 armored launch vehicles ordered by the Iraqi Army—and that they will be shipped as soon as the Baghdad government finishes paying off its debt to the Sao Paulo firm. Saudi Arabia, which already has the Astros, is also negotiating a new order for rockets.

In military circles, the difficulties at Avibras are regarded as a direct consequence of the events marking 1988—examples being Brazil's high inflation rate and the end of the Iran-Iraq War. Embraer—which manufactures the well-known Tucano aircraft and is attached to the Ministry of Aeronautics—has announced losses of \$20 million for last year.

Great Interest in Rocket Market

The establishment of Inscom is the big bombshell in the genuine war that Brazilian industry's fight to enter the international market for rockets and artificial satellites has become. Last year, after FOLHA DE SAO PAULO reported the difficulties being encountered by the Space Activities Institute (IAE) of the Ministry of Aeronautics in developing a rocket capable of launching the scientific satellites being built by the National Institute of Space Research (INPE)—and revealed that the INPE was trying unsuccessfully to lease foreign rockets for those launchings—the attention of Brazilian businessmen was drawn to that sector.

And that attention turned into good business prospects when the government announced the negotiations for a space cooperation agreement with the Chinese Ministry of Astronautics (the agreement was signed by President Jose Sarney in July of last year). The agreement provided for the joint development of two artificial satellites—10 times heavier than those being planned to date in Brazil. But the Sao Paulo firm of Orbita felt that satellite technology might be followed by the technology for building rockets, and so it immediately contacted the INPE—which was to be the Brazilian partner of the Chinese.

Orbita's interest in absorbing Chinese technology had the blessing of the INPE's manager at the time, Marco Antonio Raupp (who resigned this past January); but Raupp could never get the government interested in the undertaking, the simple reason being—as he himself was to say later—that there were so many changes of minister in the ministry concerned (the now-extinct Ministry of Science and Technology) that the matter could never be pursued with any regularity. More recently, it was the Elebra firm's turn to try to draw closer to the Chinese (see above).

But Orbita and Elebra were not the only ones to feel tempted by rockets and satellites. Around September 1988, Ozilio Silva, chairman of Embraer (which is attached to the Ministry of Aeronautics and manufactures light aircraft), presented the INPE's management with an order for a military observation satellite for Iraq, an order which could be filled thanks to the institute's experience in building its small scientific satellites.

Ozilio visited Baghdad last December to discuss the matter. But the fact that the order has a military purpose worries the Ministry of Foreign Affairs.

The establishment of Inscom differs from those other initiatives. Inscom will simply combine what Avibras already manufactures—ground-based systems for tracking artificial satellites—with what China already manufactures—space rockets—and try to transform that union into profits.

Avibras Designed Sonda Rocket

Avibras began its activities in 1961 as an aircraft manufacturer. In 1962, however, it won an international contract to produce solid rocket propellants and wound up cooperating with the Ministry of Aeronautics in the development of the Sonda family of research rockets.

After completing its work on Sonda-1 and the Sonda-2B and Sonda-2C rockets, Avibras worked on the second stage of the Sonda-3 rocket. It also worked on a three-stage rocket—known as the Barium Project—which constituted the preliminary design for the Sonda-4 rocket that has now been developed by the Ministry of Aeronautics. Technical disagreements caused Avibras to withdraw from the space program and eventually led it into the arms industry, where it beat all export records from 1985 through 1987.

PRC Negotiates Bid for Brasilsat-2 Launchers

33420050b Sao Paulo FOLHA DE SAO PAULO
in Portuguese 19 Apr 89 p F-1

[Article by Roberto Lopes, followed by interview with Chen Shouchun, executive vice president for science and technology of the China Great Wall Industry Corporation, at Avibras headquarters in Sao Jose dos Campos on 17 April 1989]

[Text] Ten months after President Jose Sarney's visit to China, the Chinese have come to Brazil to test a few of the possibilities for trade between the two countries. This morning, the China Great Wall Industry Corporation—the industrial arm of China's Ministry of Astro-nautics—will submit to the Ministry of Communications in Brasilia the documents with which it hopes to qualify for Competition No 004/89, which will determine the type of rocket that will carry the Brasilsat-2 program's two artificial satellites into space.

The competition involves a deal that will probably be worth between \$60 million and \$100 million, and there is already a clear favorite: the French Arianespace firm, which uses the world-famous Ariane rocket (launched from the Kourou base in French Guiana). Arianespace was responsible for the launchings that were part of the Brasilsat-1 phase 4 years ago. The French price is normally lower than that charged by the U.S. launching services—which will also submit bids—but the Chinese promise that they will be competitive. The qualification documents will be examined by experts at Telebras [Brazilian Telecommunications, Inc.] and Embratel [Brazilian Telecommunications Company] (the chief user of the Brasilsat program). Companies qualifying to participate in the competition will have to submit their technical and commercial proposals this coming 4 May.

First and Last

Arriving in Sao Paulo on the morning of the day before yesterday to coordinate the preparation of Great Wall's proposals was the firm's executive vice president for science and technology, Chen Shouchun (see the interview at the end of this article). In recent days, the Chinese have had their headquarters at the comfortable facilities of Sao Paulo's Avibras firm in the municipality of Sao Jose dos Campos (85 km northeast of the capital of Sao Paulo). In Beijing on the 4th of this month, that firm's London subsidiary—Avibras International—signed a partnership agreement with Great Wall establishing a new company known as International Satellite Communications (Inscom).

Inscom's plan is an ambitious one: It wants to sell rocket launching services and ground-based satellite tracking stations to the countries of Latin America, the Middle East, Asia, and Africa—that is, the so-called Third World countries. The competition for Brasilsat-2 is therefore the first and the last bidding process in connection with rocket launchings in which Great Wall will participate without the support of Inscom—which will not become operational until it is officially launched at the International Air Show at Le Bourget in Paris this coming June.

The day before yesterday, the director of government relations for Avibras (and Brazilian representative of Inscom), Pedro Vial, told FOLHA DE SAO PAULO that the new company had "a potential market worth \$50 million annually through 1994 and at least \$100 million annually thereafter through the end of the century," but those are conservative figures.

In the bidding for the Telebras contract, Great Wall has a trump card for use at the right time: the possibility of carrying out one of the two launchings from the new Brazilian space center in Alcantara, Maranhao. That center is being built by the Ministry of Aeronautics, and FAB (Brazilian Air Force) officers involved in the project know that any and all joint experience with a foreign power in the field of space launchings is welcome.

This is not the first time that the Chinese have held out the possibility of using the Alcantara center to entice Brazilian authorities. During last year's talks leading up to the signing of a scientific cooperation agreement between Brazil and China for the construction of two artificial satellites, the Chinese also hinted at the possibility of launching the second of those satellites from Alcantara. The FAB did not want the agreement with the Chinese. The top leaders in the Ministry of Aeronautics are afraid that the \$45 million which the country is going to spend on that agreement will be needed for development of the space rocket that the Space Activities Institute (IAE) of the Ministry of Aeronautics is developing with so much difficulty.

The Chinese believe that the option of making a launch from the Alcantara center is a strong argument. They consider it unlikely that another space power such as France will agree to bring its technicians, its infrastructure, and especially its launch technology to the humble State of Maranhao.

What the Chinese are not saying, but thinking, is that their greatest chance of winning the Telebras contract lies in the excellent relationship currently existing between the two countries. They are gambling on the Brazilian desire to expand cultural exchange with China—a desire that has already produced the scientific cooperation agreement in the field of artificial satellites—and especially on a kind of Third World spirit with which China seems to be strongly imbued.

Telebras To Choose Supplier

By the end of June, Telebras will announce the winner of the contract for supplying the two artificial satellites for geostationary orbit that will operate in space as part of the second phase of the Brasilsat Satellite Communications Program (Brasilsat-2). Competing in the bidding are the Spar Company of Canada and Hughes of the United States, the latter with a price on the order of \$155 million (about \$320 million new cruzados at the unofficial exchange rate).

A little over a month ago, when Hughes announced details of its technical proposal during a luncheon at the Maksoud Plaza Hotel in Sao Paulo, some Brazilian sponsors of the event leaked information that the American proposal could be estimated at \$90 million. But Brazilian businessmen interested in a victory for Hughes now say that Spar's price is even higher than the American company's price, since it comes close to \$200 million (about 400 million new cruzados at the unofficial rate of exchange).

On the other hand, Spar has joined with the Victory firm, a member of the Roberto Marinho group, in its bid to win the satellite contract, while Hughes has joined with Promon Engineering—a firm with a good technical reputation but without Victory's lobbying strength.

The first of the two Brasilsat-2 satellites is to be placed in orbit in 1991. The Brazilian Government has established a few requirements for foreign companies wishing to qualify for the bidding. The most important are these: 1) there must be an association with the Brazilian business community for actual technological cooperation; 2) exports of Brazilian products must equal the full value of the contract signed with Telebras; and 3) two military communication channels to be administered by the Armed Forces General Staff (EMFA) must be included.

Chinese Technology Not Attractive to Brazil

Ever since diplomatic relations were restored on 15 August 1974, Brazil and China have had a cordial

relationship, with many projects for cultural and scientific cooperation but few business deals of any importance. The Chinese have a taste for rusticity—which they label simplicity—on an unending list of consumer goods and production goods, while Brazil, like a typical nation of the future, skids along in search of high technology.

As a matter of fact, high technology has become a national mania. The Brazilian consumer demands high technology even in his toothbrush. Strangely enough, there are pockets of knowledge in which the Chinese have developed highly competitive advanced technology. This is the case, for example, in certain sectors of military science—nuclear experiments, for example. In the second half of last year, the Chinese announced successful experiments with neutron bombs that surprised the most attentive military observers in the West and the Soviet bloc. It is also the case in the field of astronautics.

China has been developing rockets and artificial satellites for 40 years. In the 1960's and 1970's, it prepared to place an artificial satellite in space, something it did not achieve until 24 April 1970. In the following year, it launched its second satellite, and between 1975 and 1984, it launched half a dozen of those satellites, easily achieving the rank of the world's third-largest space power (being surpassed only by the United States and the Soviet Union).

Long March

China's real technological leap in space has been achieved, however, in the field of rockets. Driven by a real obsession not to be left too far behind in the arms race among the big powers, the Chinese developed the family of Long March rockets. The first Chinese long-range rocket—Long March-1 (or CZ-1)—was ready in 1970 for launching the first artificial satellite ever produced in that country. Long March-2 was ready in 1974—and became the first weapon of truly strategic value in the Chinese arsenal—while Long March-3 became operational during the first half of the 1980's.

That is the niche in high technology which Brazil has been trying to approach in recent years through such projects as the one for cooperation in building artificial satellites. The Chinese are aware of this, and they are gambling on that Brazilian desire to achieve other successes.

Interview With Chen Shouchun

The China Great Wall Industry Corporation's vice president for science and technology, Chen Shouchun, is a smiling man about 40 years old who wears simple but elegant clothes of European cut. There is nothing to remind one of the tasteless suits of the Mao era. He does not speak English well (or pretends not to), but seems to understand perfectly whatever is said to him in that

language. His answers are not always brief, but their content is never very detailed. In addition to that, he smiles a lot, of course.

The day before yesterday, in an office at the Avibras firm in São José dos Campos, São Paulo (Avibras recently concluded a partnership agreement with the Chinese for offering satellite launchings to Third World countries), Chen—who on his business card precedes his title as "executive vice president" with the words "senior engineer" (in boldface)—granted a quick interview to FOLHA DE SAO PAULO. He talked about the ability of his firm in particular and his country in general to participate in international bidding.

[FOLHA DE SAO PAULO] "Aren't you afraid to do business with the government of a country like Brazil, which is in an almost permanent state of economic crisis?"

[Chen Shouchun] "I feel that we are not offering commodities or superfluous articles, items of clothing, or anything like that. We are talking about a long-term investment in high technology, something that is necessary to any country."

[FOLHA DE SAO PAULO] "Those who compete with the Chinese in the international market usually complain that China's proposals lower prices too much, even to the point of debasing them. Is that a market strategy or the consequence of cheap manpower in your country?"

[Chen Shouchun] "I can give you at least five reasons. And the first of them is the simplicity of our products. The best example of this is the success of the Japanese firm of Toyota. You can cover a lot of distance on the

road in a German car in complete comfort. But you can also cover the same distance in a Toyota vehicle, which is simpler, more economical, and just as reliable."

[FOLHA DE SAO PAULO] "The second reason?"

[Chen Shouchun] "I would say that it is a question of reliability. We have already made 25 launchings with our Long March rockets, and all were completely successful. That is important."

[FOLHA DE SAO PAULO] "The third reason?"

[Chen Shouchun] "The fact that we produce all the components we use in our rockets and in other systems serving our space program, such as satellites and ground control stations. We import nothing from the United States or the Soviet Union. Thanks to that domestic production, we reduce the final cost of the products."

[FOLHA DE SAO PAULO] "So far you have not mentioned the matter of manpower. Isn't that a determining factor in Chinese competitiveness?"

[Chen Shouchun] "Yes, undoubtedly."

[FOLHA DE SAO PAULO] "Could it be that it is even cheaper than Brazilian manpower?"

[Chen Shouchun] "Yes, cheaper than in Brazil."

[FOLHA DE SAO PAULO] "You mentioned five reasons."

[Chen Shouchun] "We are not looking for profits" (and he burst into sonorous laughter).

INDIA

Reportage, Commentary on Agni IRBM Test Launch

Successful Launch Announced

BK2205033889 *Delhi Domestic Service in English*
0335 GMT 22 May 89

[Text] The technology-proven maiden long-range missile "Agni" was launched successfully from Chandipur in Balasore District of Orissa by scientists and engineers of the Defense Research and Development Organization at 0717 this morning [0247 GMT]. The defense minister, Mr Pant, and others were present on the occasion.

Further Report

BK2205065189 *Delhi Domestic Service in English*
0630 GMT 22 May 89

[Text] The country's first intermediate range surface-to-surface missile Agni was successfully launched from the interim test range at Chandipur on the seacoast of Orissa at 17 minutes past 7 this morning [0247 GMT]. Among those who witnessed the launching were the defense minister, Mr K.C. Pant; the minister of state for defense, Mr Chintamani Panigrahi; the scientific adviser to the defense minister, Dr V.S. Arunachalam; and a large number of scientists and officers of the Defense Research and Development Organization.

Agni is a two-stage missile. The entire design, development, fabrication, and testing of subsystems and components is indigenous. The lead laboratory in the program was the Defense Research and Development Laboratory at Hyderabad. The maiden test launch is in the basic nature of proven advanced missile technology developed under the integrated guided missile development program.

Our correspondent says that the successful maiden flight of Agni renews the country's confidence in the capabilities of our scientific and technical community and in the maturity of indigenous technology. The technology-proven test flight of Agni today has met all range safety requirements, setting at rest the fears expressed in some quarters about safety precautions associated with such operations. The central and state government had made special arrangements by temporarily moving some sections of the local population for a few hours as part of range safety requirements.

The president, Mr R. Venkataraman, has congratulated the scientists, engineers, and all those associated with the successful launching of the missile Agni. In a message from Simla, the president said that the launch is a tribute to their dedication, hard work, and talent. He said it is a milestone in the country's scientific endeavor through self-reliance.

Gandhi Hails Missile Test

BK2205103889 *Delhi Domestic Service in English*
0830 GMT 22 May 89

[Excerpts] The country's first long-range surface-to-surface missile, Agni, was successfully launched from the interim test range at Chandipur on the seacoast of Orissa at 17 minutes past 7 this morning [0247 GMT]. [passage omitted]

The prime minister, Mr Rajiv Gandhi, said that this is a major achievement in our continuing effort to safeguard the country's independence and security by self-reliant means.

The prime minister described the launching of Agni as a national endeavor in the pursuit of self-reliance. He said that it is not a nuclear weapon system. What Agni does is to afford us the option of developing the ability to deliver non-nuclear weapons with high precision at long ranges. It provides us with a viable non-nuclear option of the greatest relevance to the contemporary strategic doctrine.

The prime minister said India has no aggressive designs on anyone. We are passionately committed to peaceful coexistence and nuclear disarmament. The action plan presented by India for a nuclear free and nonviolent world order derived its inspiration from India's abiding commitment to the ideals and vision of Mahatma Gandhi, Jawahar Lal Nehru, and Indira Gandhi.

Media Hail Launch, Criticize U.S.

BK2305105489 *Hong Kong AFP in English* 1033 GMT
23 May 89

[Text] New Delhi, May 23 (AFP)—Newspapers here hailed Tuesday the launch of India's maiden intermediate range ballistic missile (IRBM) and said it would boost the country's deterrent capabilities.

Most dailies said the launch was significant because New Delhi's biggest neighbours China and Pakistan—with which India has fought a total of four wars—possessed, or were in the process of manufacturing, similar systems.

Editorials and commentators also flayed the United States for criticising Indian efforts to launch the missile, called Agni (fire), saying Washington was indulging in discrimination.

The 19-metre (62-foot) high, two-stage surface-to-surface Agni was test fired Monday from eastern India's coastal Chandipur region, 32 days after the first attempt to launch was called off because of technical snags.

A second try on May 1 was also called off for similar reasons.

THE TIMES OF INDIA described Agni's launch as "the biggest step forward in India's quest for a credible

deterrant capability" since the 1974 explosion of a nuclear device in northwest India.

"The real success of such a capability is that it should never have to be used," it said. "It has to be achieved nevertheless. This is specially so with regard to missiles because of their proliferation in our neighbourhood."

The HINDUSTAN TIMES described Agni's blast-off as "an unqualified success," while the ECONOMIC TIMES said it "is an occasion for gratification."

THE HINDU newspaper noted that Agni—which has a range of up to 2,500 kilometres (1,560 miles)—had military overtones and, mentioning Pakistan and China by name, added that "the signals it sends out are undoubtedly of special significance."

Noted defence analyst K. Subrahmanyam said Agni was the first step in the country's attempt "to fill a vital gap in its security needs," and referred to the missile programmes of China and Pakistan. China, with which India fought a brief border war in 1962, also possesses IRBM's.

"Pakistan is said to have tested an unnamed missile capable of hitting Delhi and Bombay which puts it very near the IRBM category," Mr. Subrahmanyam said.

Prime Minister Rajiv Gandhi said Monday that Agni would provide New Delhi with a non-nuclear option "with high precision at long ranges."

He added that the "technology proved in the Agni is deeply significant for evolving national security options."

An official statement released Monday echoed the prime minister's views, and added that Agni was "expected to provide such options to the country in facing an increasingly complex security environment."

Agni's launch attempts drew criticism from the U.S. Government, and moves were reportedly afoot in Washington to impose trade sanctions against India and block technology transfers if New Delhi went ahead with the test firing.

Newspapers Tuesday accused the United States of adopting double standards.

Washington, THE TIMES OF INDIA said, "has not said a word about the capability Israel demonstrated by testing its latest nuclear-capable missile and its bid... to export the technology to others."

THE HINDUSTAN TIMES praised the government for standing up to "overt and covert pressures" by the U.S., while the pro-Moscow PATRIOT newspaper criticised Washington for keeping quiet about Pakistani missile programmes.

"Washington's pressure on India is, therefore, meant to retain for a member of the U.S.-Pakistan-China strategic consensus, all advantages that nuclear weapons and missiles delivery systems give," the PATRIOT said.

New Delhi has said the launch was intended as a show of its technological capabilities and that it had no intention of mass-producing the missile.

India successfully test-fired a missile called Prithvi (Earth), with a range of 250 kilometres (155 miles), in February 1988.

But the country's civilian space programme suffered a major setback five months later when a missile, the Augmented Satellite Launch Vehicle, crashed into the Bay of Bengal 150 seconds after lift-off.

News reports after Agni's launch said that Indian scientists would begin work on production of an inter-continental ballistic missile with a range of more than 5,000 kilometres (3,125 miles).

Public Hails Launch

BK2305161889 *Delhi Domestic Service in English*
1530 GMT 23 May 89

[Text] More reports of nation-wide acclaim of the scientists, engineers, technicians, and others who were associated with the launching of the [intermediate-range surface-to-surface missile] Agni yesterday has come in. The achievement has generated a feeling of confidence and happiness among the people in all walks of life. They consider the event as symbolizing the country's progress in advance research and indigenous technology. State governors, chief ministers, and others have hailed the launch and greeted the team of workers who made it possible.

Welcoming the launch, the Congress-I has described it as a matter of pride for all. In a statement the six general secretaries of the party, Mr V.N. Gadgil, Mr Ghulam Nabi Azad, Mrs Sheila Kaul, Mr K.N. Singh, Mr Oscar Fernandes, and Mr A.R. Mallu, and the treasurer, Mr Sitaram Kesari have said that, appropriately, this feat was achieved in the Nehru centenary year as it was Jawahar Lal Nehru who made self-reliance in scientific [as heard] temper the cardinal principles of the Congress ideology. They congratulated the prime minister and the scientists who worked under his leadership with dedication and determination to make this possible.

Some opposition parties have also congratulated the scientists for the achievement. Among them are the Communist Party of India, the Bhartiya Janata Party, Telugu Desam, and the Janata Dal. In a resolution passed at the conference of its office bearers in Bangalore today, the Janata Dal said the event heralds a new era in missile technology.

Commentary on Agni Launch

*BK2305110589 Delhi General Overseas Service
in English 1010 GMT 23 May 89*

[Science editor K.S. Jayaraman commentary]

[Text] India reached a major milestone in military missile development technology yesterday when it successfully test-fired its first intermediate-range ballistic missile [IRBM], Agni. The two-stage missile weighing 14 tons and about 19 meters tall took off from Defense Ministry's test range in Chandipur on the east coast of Orissa State in the early hours of the morning [22 May], ushering India into the select club of nations that have the capability to design and build such long-range missiles.

The IRBM is a result of about 6 years of work by scientists of the Defense Research Development Organization. Agni is the third missile to roll out of defense laboratories under the integrated guided missile development program, that has a budget of about \$500 million. Trishul, a 12-kilometer-range surface-to-air missile was test flown in 1987. A year later India successfully tested Prithvi, a surface-to-surface missile having a range of about 250 kilometers. Agni is the most advanced in the family of missiles. Its first stage is solid propelled, and the second stage has twin engines powered by a storable liquid fuel. The missile is designed to deliver a 1-ton warhead at a target as far away as 2,500 kilometers within about 8 minutes. The missile is equipped with a strap-down inertial navigation system and an on-board computer to carry out the task of guidance and flight control.

Yesterday's launch was described by the defense minister, Mr K.C. Pant, as a test flight to prove the indigenously developed advanced missile technology. The Indian Government has not announced details of yesterday's test flights, except that the missile followed the predetermined flight path and impacted in the designated area in the Bay of Bengal. According to an official announcement, preliminary analyses of data indicated that the test flight fully met the mission's objectives. One of the mission's objectives was to evaluate the performance of an indigenously developed heat shield during the fiery reentry through the atmosphere. The heat shield that is meant to protect the warhead from intense heat is a key hardware in the defense delivery system. The heat shield was developed by the defense scientists quite some time ago and was being tested for the first time by Agni.

The successful test flight of Agni has demonstrated India's technological capability, but it cannot be interpreted as a signal that India wishes to become a regional superpower. While hailing the achievement, the Indian prime minister, Mr Rajiv Gandhi, emphasized that India is a nonviolent country and has no aggressive designs on anyone. The testing of Agni was part of India's continuing efforts to safeguard the country's independence and security by self-reliant means, he said. According to the prime minister, a great deal of misinformation and disinformation has been spread by interested quarters that the Indian missile would be used to carry a nuclear warhead. In a statement, Mr Gandhi made it clear that Agni is not a nuclear weapon system. It only gives us an option to deliver nonnuclear weapons with high precision at (?long) range, an option that is of great relevance to contemporary strategic doctrine, he said.

India detonated a nuclear device 15 years ago, but it set an example to the whole world by its refusal to convert this nuclear capability into nuclear weapons. It wishes to keep it that way, Mr Gandhi said, adding that India is passionately committed to peaceful coexistence. India firmly believes that Agni, while providing a limited deterrence, will in no way become a threat to regional peace. As one Indian defense analyst puts it: Agni, which has broken the big power monopoly, may be a major contribution to India's negotiating strength for advancing international peace and stability.

PAKISTAN**Agni IRBM Launch by India Reported**

*BK2205085389 Islamabad Overseas Service in English
0800 GMT 22 May 89*

[Text] India has successfully test fired today its first intermediate-range ballistic missile—Agni—which had been bogged down by technical snags for a month. The missile, launched from the Chandipur area of eastern Orissa State, has a range of up to 2,500 km and has been targeted to land in the Bay of Bengal.

Defense experts have said "Agni" can also be equipped with nuclear warhead or used to launch satellites.

The launch put India in an exclusive club of countries—which so far includes the United States, China, Soviet Union, Britain, France, and Israel—with their own ballistic missile capability.

Meanwhile, the United States has expressed concern over India's development of the missile.

FEDERAL REPUBLIC OF GERMANY

Issues of SNF Deterrence Value Analyzed
36200174 Hamburg DIE ZEIT in German
5 May 89 pp 13-15

[Analysis by Karl Kaiser, director of Research Institute of German Society for Foreign Policy, Bonn, and professor of Political Science at Cologne University: "Do We Still Need Atomic Weapons?—In the Disarmament Phase, Nuclear Deterrence Remains Indispensable Insurance." Karl Kaiser's article appears in expanded form in EUROPA ARCHIV.]

[Text] "Should the demand for withdrawal of tactical nuclear weapons become the policy of West Germany, it would put an end to the risk community of the alliance."

The antinuclear demonstrations have disappeared from the streets. For the first time, medium-range nuclear weapons are being withdrawn and scrapped in a verified agreement under the INF (Intermediate Nuclear Forces) Treaty. The discussion on nuclear weapons has not calmed down, however. On the contrary: the differences of opinion regarding the value and the future of nuclear weapons penetrate deeper than in the times of the loudest protests at the beginning of the 1980's.

The skepticism of the German populace towards nuclear weapons has seen little fundamental change since the controversy over rearmament. Certainly, though, the eternally positive position of the government elite has changed. More restrained language in the justification of deterrence, and, yes, even nervousness in handling this subject, characterize their behavior.

In addition, Gorbachev's reform policy and his diverse disarmament initiatives have resulted in the question being seriously asked, whether in these circumstances another modernization of nuclear weapons is necessary. Out of the developments in the East, many people extrapolate a fantasy picture which they portray as fully-developed reality. As a result, they want to take radical measures regarding defense and the alliance.

They assume in advance there will be success in the new negotiations on conventional weapons, from which comes the question, whether nuclear weapons are even necessary in Europe then. The INF Treaty demonstrated to many that a continuing process of nuclear disarmament is conceivable. A routine decision such as that regarding modernization of short-range rockets is then characterized as a survival issue for the alliance.

Conventional Disarmament and Nuclear Arms

Amazing things have happened on the disarmament field between East and West. After 16 years of fruitless MBFR (Mutual Balanced Forces Reduction) negotiations in Vienna, the starting positions for the new rounds

of negotiations on conventional weapons are considerably improved. The East accepts the principle of asymmetrical disarmament where there is imbalance, and is in agreement with the West regarding the objective of eliminating the ability to launch a theater-wide offensive and a surprise attack. In the INF Treaty and the Stockholm CSCE Agreement, NATO and the Warsaw Pact have accepted a degree of mutual on-site control never seen before. This ranges up to production monitoring and suspicion control. Unilateral disarmament measures and a reform policy of the Soviet Union directed towards redistributing financial resources allow one to suppose that for the first time there is a real opportunity to substantially reduce conventional warfare potential. This opens new horizons. The realistic hope exists that the central threat to Western Europe posed by the conventional power of the Soviet Union, which led to the formation of NATO 40 years ago, will be reduced.

For over 2 decades, it was necessary for NATO to station nuclear weapons in Europe based on the conventional superiority of the Warsaw Pact. Many believe today that with a reduction in arms levels to an approximate conventional balance, and even more so with mutual elimination of the capacity for theater-wide offensive and surprise attack, nuclear weapons can be reduced if they are not completely unnecessary. Even in the governing coalition, the opinion is surfacing that given success in the Vienna negotiations, nuclear weapons can be eliminated.

Now, it has come home to roost in that the main argument for nuclear weapons in Europe has been pushed into the background: namely, their war-inhibiting function. They remain indispensable even under the conditions of conventional parity. The potential destructiveness of nuclear weapons has changed human and state behavior so fundamentally that not one round has been fired between the United States and the Soviet Union and their allies. Europe became an island of peace after 1945—the rest of the world experienced about 140 wars during the same time period with millions of dead. Several of the large crises in Europe—those in Berlin for example—would have probably led to war if the existence of nuclear weapons had not tied an unacceptable risk to a military conflict.

The fundamental maxim that nuclear weapons rule out war as a means of politics would also apply in a Europe where conventional disarmament had achieved its first results. The ability to launch limited and selective conventional attacks will not and cannot be eliminated through such reductions. Even under conditions of conventional parity, an attacker who can select the location of the attack and concentrate his forces there will certainly be able to obtain bargaining chips. Border cities, and especially Berlin, could be the site of selective actions which would be without risk for the aggressor if he knew in advance that the West had ruled out a nuclear response.

For that reason, the assertions made by Helmut Schmidt (DIE ZEIT, 3 Mar 89) and many others that nuclear weapons are only supposed to restrict the enemy's use of nuclear weapons and that the West would never be the first to use nuclear weapons all signal a fundamental change in the situation: a zone of guaranteed nuclear-free warfare would be re-created. Conventional war would again be feasible. The principle victim of such a development would be West Germany.

It is argued that structural changes would not only reduce offensive ability, but should and could lead to "attack inability." Attack inability in the sense of a theater-wide and all-encompassing invasion in Europe is in fact possible through appropriate reductions and restructuring. Attack inability in the sense of limited and selective operations is in itself impossible to achieve. Even if East and West disarmed their armies to lightly-armed foot soldiers, the ability to attack would not be ruled out. It would only disappear after there were no more soldiers and weapons.

For this reason, there cannot be a pure "conventional stability." Even in times of conventional disarmament, a plausible nuclear component is necessary to preclude war as a means of politics. Conventional stability is only achievable when the nuclear dimension behind rules out the use of any military force. Nuclear weapons in Europe remain an indispensable security net, even with reduced conventional force, to prevent war.

The geopolitical asymmetry between the United States and the Soviet Union remains in existence. Even after successful support of military potential, the Soviet Union can upset the military balance relatively quickly by introducing troops from the European portion of their country. For political and technical reasons, western Europe cannot counter that with an appropriate mobilization, because America must bring in troops over 3,900 miles from across the Atlantic.

Paradoxically, the more radical the reductions and the more that the remaining troops are characterized by higher quality, greater mobility and firepower, the greater the effect. The fewer units protecting the approximately 600 mile line of defense in central Europe, the more easily an attacker can build a local superiority for selective and limited attack operations through a concentration of forces—above all by reinforcements from the rear. For this reason, nuclear deterrence remains the indispensable insurance against the breakout of war. Indeed, the more decisive the reduction (in arms), the more forcefully the West is pointed towards a nuclear minimum as a safety net for the prevention of war.

Gorbachev: End of the Threat?

Gorbachev has undoubtedly worked a fundamental change in Soviet domestic and foreign policy. His restructuring—away from Stalinism towards greater openness and democratization—gradually effects a

change in direction where it will be more difficult for the Soviets to prepare and conduct an offensive war. The indicators of change are similarly radical in foreign policy: admission of their own past grave mistakes (such as the SS-20 buildup), turn towards a political concept of security, withdrawal from the overwhelming tonnage mindset of the military, changing military doctrine to the defensive, preparedness to reduce eastern advantages and to make drastic cuts in the nuclear weapons arsenal all the way up to its substantial elimination, proclamation of unilateral reductions, preparedness to tolerate plurality and greater independence in the socialist camp.

These changes have fundamentally changed the West's picture of the threat. There is a new answer to the classic question of how to evaluate the relationship between military ability and political intent. In the past, the conventional superiority of the Soviets in conjunction with the politically offensive character of the regime was seen as particularly threatening. In both regards, the threat is redefined today as somewhat less, in which the reduction in military superiority in the East is given as already completed and it is assumed that the non-expansionist, peaceful character of the regime is guaranteed forever.

Under careful inspection, it can be seen that it will be many years before Gorbachev reaches his foreign policy and national security goals. This also requires successful negotiations with the West. In addition, actions such as unilateral reductions do not just reduce the Soviet quantitative military potential, but rather simultaneously increase its quality and with it military effectiveness. Even 4 years after coming to power, Gorbachev could not maintain a reduction in the enormous arms production levels which exceed Western (levels) by several times in many areas, even though he desperately needs to move funds from the military to the civilian sector.

Beyond this, military capacity which can also be misused for offensive purposes will be maintained for years to come. For the transition period, the problem arises in every case of embedding the reduction of military potential in East and West in some framework which insures stability. This demands above all a functional alliance and a functioning deterrence: an insurance which should prevent war and political extortion. In addition, there is the fact that fundamental change in the East Bloc could break out at any time into upheavals and destabilizing explosions. This could also strike through the East-West relationship and endanger peace.

Destabilizing change in the East can extend to the East-West relationship if it leads to the fall of the Gorbachev regime in the Soviet Union and a takeover by Russian-nationalist forces or other forces which could follow a different foreign policy course. A reversal of the reforms directed by Gorbachev would also be conceivable as a result of sustained mistakes, repeated poor

harvests, majority-changing power struggles or unpredictable acts of destiny in the reformers' group of leaders.

According to the Harrel concept of 1967, the West must be prepared to defend itself against the East as well as cooperate with it. Further development of cooperation and the expansion of relations with the East will also remain a precept of western policy in the future. But there is still also the necessity of maintaining the western alliance with a functional deterrence: as a safety net to preclude catastrophic developments and to insure peace. Of course, the pursuit of the desirable—detente and cooperation—is a part, but the possibility of the undesirable, namely the historic reaction, must never be ignored. For this reason, policy must observe limits in the reduction of military capacity. Gorbachev's reforms do not yet justify the abandonment of flexibility through the elimination of tactical atomic weapon capacity in Europe.

Nuclear Weapons Off of German Soil?

Recently, a notion reappeared which had surfaced in the 1950's in the discussion about nuclear-free zones and then was revived during the rearment controversy: the demand to move all atomic weapons from the territory of non-nuclear nations back to the nuclear weapon nations, thereby making the two German states and some neighboring countries nuclear weapon free. Egon Bahr has advocated this concept most strongly and the SPD's [Social Democratic Party of Germany] nuclear policy has amounted to this position since its Muenster Party Congress in 1988.

This concept is based on problematic assumptions and motives.

There was once the notion that only nuclear weapons were worthwhile targets for enemy nuclear weapons, and so their withdrawal would protect a country such as West Germany from nuclear attack. This assumption is false, as nuclear weapons can also be used against conventional targets such as command posts, air fields or troop concentrations.

Secondly, behind this concept stands the thought that with the breakout of hostilities, the nuclear weapons in the front lines would be used prematurely to prevent their capture by enemy troops; a nuclear escalation would be introduced unintentionally according to the "use them or lose them" motto. This assumption is unrealistic, because a nuclear war would not be started because of the threat of losing a few warheads in a relatively large arsenal.

Third, this concept is based on the goal of damage limitation. The withdrawal of nuclear weapons is supposed to prevent such weapons from being exploded on German soil; the deterrence should be exclusively exercised through the strategic weapons systems of the

United States (and those of France and Great Britain). But the withdrawal of nuclear weapons from West Germany does not protect us at all from long range Soviet nuclear weapons. Beyond that, limitation of deterrence to purely strategic systems would create a zone of guaranteed conventional warfare in Europe and would increase the probability of war here: the Americans' strategic weapons cannot deter limited conventional conflicts, because their use would lead to large-scale nuclear war and self-destruction by the superpowers.

A partial deterrence reduced to strategic weapons could function in times of detente—but actually they are unnecessary then. In times of crisis, when deterrence is needed, they can hardly be reinstated, because rapid redeployment of tactical nuclear weapons to Europe is politically and technically extremely difficult, if not completely impossible.

Fourth, there is the opinion that (West Germany) really has no say in the matter of whether to use atomic weapons, but that their withdrawal rules out the danger of use contrary to German interests. The fact is, however, that active German assistance in the development target and deployment plans and the German participation in the potential decision to use nuclear weapons (under American veto rights) was considerably increased under governments in the 1960's in which the Social Democrats participated. It is precisely tactical nuclear weapons, the ones being challenged, which have institutionalized a German voice in decisions to be made.

Fifth, resonating with the demands for withdrawal is the claim that the superpowers could recklessly conduct a limited nuclear war on German or European soil, and that this can be best prevented by the withdrawal of all tactical nuclear weapons. Such a claim overlooks the caution and restraint practiced for 40 years by both superpowers as they dealt with each other—caution and restraint which has now become a rigid norm. In its 4 decades of existence, nuclear deterrence has developed into a complex system of agreed rules of procedure, institutionally guaranteed norms, selective cooperation and mutual respect—also and directly due to the conditions of mutual destruction capability. So "common security" has been practiced long before the Palme commission introduced this term as a norm of international behavior in 1982.

Should the demand for withdrawal of tactical nuclear weapons become the policy of West Germany, it would be the end of the risk community of the alliance. It would create a zone of limited conventional warfare and with it the increased probability of war. It is difficult to see why the other members of the alliance who are responsible for the defense of West Germany would tolerate such a risky policy. The American troop presence, which is vital for the stability of Europe, would be thoroughly in doubt if such a proposal were realized.

Modernize Down to the Nuclear Minimum

Result: The maintenance of a minimum amount of nuclear deterrence under the level of strategic weapons remains the basic condition for maintaining peace even in the period of East-West arms control which lies before us.

The search for an optimum tactical nuclear weapon potential is an old theme for NATO. As a result of the internal discussions, the alliance has unilaterally reduced its arsenal of 7,000 tactical warheads in Europe since 1979—in 10 years—down to 4,600. With full compliance with the INF treaty, the number will be reduced further down to 3,200 by 1992. This capacity is roughly estimated to be distributed among 1,500 artillery warheads (with a maximum range of about 19 miles), 1,000 aerial bombs and 700 warheads for the Lance rockets with a range of 75 miles.

In order to achieve a maximum of war-preventing deterrence with a minimum of nuclear weapons, a further reduction in capacity in western Europe is conceivable, possible, and desirable. But the minimum amount cannot be achieved through simple removal of existing warheads. The simple ground rule must govern: the lower the number of tactical nuclear weapons, the higher the qualitative demands which must be satisfied to maintain a credible deterrence. This either refers to invulnerability or accuracy. Stated differently: The smaller the remaining arsenal of tactical nuclear weapons, the greater the need for modernization—therefore maximization of its quality, change in its quality and change in its composition. The question of range is of particular significance in this regard.

The short range characteristic of nuclear artillery is a particular problem. Their military use is questionable, because their use can also include friendly troops in the casualties. Second, they are not credible because the enemy knows what restrictions the users of these weapons must clear. Third, they take away from the legitimacy of the system of nuclear deterrence because they especially place before German eyes the picture of nuclear warfare on German soil, and push the political function of nuclear deterrence into the background.

Concerning the range of tactical nuclear weapons, the European governments including the West German Government have long called for the provision of sufficient nuclear arms options with greater range. In the NATO decisions of Montebello and Gleneagles, this basic concept was taken into account: if there is to be a threat of nuclear weapon use for the purpose of preventing war, then it should harm the aggressor and not the defender. The German side has always placed particular value on this.

More than other allied countries, West Germany is a potential target of attack and bears the burden of the lowest level of deterrence more than others. It can

therefore expect special effort from the western alliance to make this bearable. This means:

- It is necessary to give up nuclear weapons with short range and to completely eliminate the nuclear artillery. In this regard, a zero-solution must be carried out.
- The Lance rockets should remain ready for deployment until provision of newer, longer range alternatives, even if repair measures are necessary.
- Nuclear bombs, which have little credibility given the strongly limited ability of bomber aircraft to penetrate, should be replaced by new air-to-ground rockets (rear-echelon weapons) with a range from 250 to 375 miles.
- The option of sea-based cruise missiles appears to make little sense, since this option could be negotiated away by the United States and the USSR with START, and such weapons have a strategic character which therefore make their tactical use in Europe hardly credible.
- The controversial option of a land-based successor to the Lance with a range of about 300 miles would be desirable under the principle of invulnerability of a minimum amount of tactical capacity. Of course, the military effectiveness of this system will have to be weighed against the political cost caused by its implementation: undermining the legitimacy of nuclear deterrence, loss of support for defense and the alliance. The gain in efficiency does not justify the political costs. Besides, it cannot be understood why aircraft-borne rockets with the same range as one of the Lance successors cannot assume exactly the same military function from West German territory as a land-based Lance-successor rocket.
- The participation by West Germany in the planning and decisionmaking regarding nuclear weapons must be maintained for two reasons. First, even after a restructuring of the tactical-nuclear forces, the Bundeswehr (West German Armed Forces) should participate with carrier weapons. Second, it must remain in force that planning and evaluation of an allied nuclear option from German soil is tied to approval of the German government.
- A shrunken, modernized minimum amount of tactical nuclear weapons must avoid any singularization of West Germany through geographic distribution. If an air-borne rear echelon becomes the primary device of a modern minimum, a greater number of European allies can participate from German soil as well as from their own.

As never before in the post-war years, there is the chance for sweeping disarmament and arms control in the nuclear and conventional fields in the coming years. This disarmament process will certainly require many more years. It must be embedded in regional conditions which offer calculable parameters for our own policies as well as for the opposing partner. In an epoch of change which can also turn stormy and does not rule out catastrophic setbacks, an architecture of stability must be preserved.

Parts of that architecture is the maintenance of the basic components of the system of nuclear deterrence, with all its agreed and rewritten rules of partial cooperation and restraint in international behavior. They have in the past precluded war as a means of politics. Conventional disarmament in no way makes deterrence superfluous. Precisely with a lower level of parity, a Soviet mobilization of military forces would endanger a greatly disarmed West much more than today.

It is exactly under the conditions of reduced military capacity that nuclear deterrence remains indispensable insurance against political setbacks in the East. Maintenance of the western structure of stability formed through alliance and deterrence signals the other side that even with personnel or political changes there will be no room given for adventure, and will thereby keep the process of change on track which secures the East-West peace.

Kohl Appeals to Europeans on Short-Range Missile Question

LD1905130189 Hamburg DPA in German 1213 GMT
19 May 89

[Text] Hamburg (DPA)—Federal Chancellor Helmut Kohl insists that NATO, in the framework of a comprehensive concept, show movement on the question of short-range missiles. He assumes that all continental European NATO powers feel the same way, "whether it be the French president or my Italian colleague De Mita," said Kohl in an interview with the private television station SAT-1 [as received], to be broadcast Sunday. "I do not want anything unreasonable," said Kohl, but since these weapons, with a range of up to 500 kilometers, affect the Germans primarily, he expects that the U.S. partners and his colleague in London, as well as his friends in Paris, The Hague, and Rome should "think of the Germans in this matter."

He has grounds to assume that this "perfectly reasonable demand" is also meeting with increasing understanding in the United States. The Germans have made many prior concessions and are continuing to do so. "In a situation which is of particular concern to us, this should be taken into account. We have a moral right to that, and it is this which I represent."

The text of the interview was prereleased to DPA.

Defense Minister Stoltenberg Assesses SNF Talks With U.S. Officials

'Met with More Understanding'
AU1905183789 Mainz ZDF Television Network
in German 1700 GMT 19 May 89

[Interview with Defense Minister Gerhard Stoltenberg by unidentified reporter in Washington on 19 May—recorded]

[Text] [Reporter] Mr Stoltenberg, you do not claim to have settled all problems. However, what specific results are you taking home?

[Stoltenberg] In very good and also concrete discussions, I was able to explain our position on the short-range missile issue—the preconditions and modalities of the inclusion of the missiles in the negotiations. I have the impression that our arguments have met with more understanding, and that a narrowing of differences is becoming discernible. We—and this also holds true for the U.S. partners with whom I had talks—still hope that we will arrive at a joint position prior to the NATO summit, which we must, of course, discuss with the other allies before the summit.

[Reporter] Would you say that a quarrel over this controversy at the summit has been averted?

[Stoltenberg] I consider a quarrel on this issue unlikely. However, we still have not formed a definite opinion on this issue.

Agreement Expected 'by Next Weekend'

LD2105151589 Hamburg DPA in German 1457 GMT
21 May 89

[Text] Bonn (DPA)—Following the exploratory talks of Defense Minister Gerhard Stoltenberg (CDU) in Washington, the Federal Government now assumes that there will be agreement on the issue of short-range nuclear missiles by next weekend. After a 2-hour conversation at the Chancellery this afternoon, government spokesman Hans Klein announced the formulation of new German proposals in reply to U.S. demands. This includes, according to reports from the United States, the demand to talk about the reduction of short-range nuclear missiles once certain concrete results at the Vienna negotiations on conventional arms are achieved and to exclude the total scrapping of this weapon category: third zero option.

Federal Chancellor Helmut Kohl, who conferred with Stoltenberg and Federal Foreign Minister Hans-Dietrich Genscher, intends to convey the new German paper by letter to U.S. President George Bush on Monday [22 May], and afterwards explain it to both Bush and the other NATO heads of state by telephone, Klein said. Klein refused to elaborate details or contents of the working paper.

Differences With U.S. Noted

LD2205142789 Hamburg DPA in German 1357 GMT
22 May 89

[Excerpt] Bonn (DPA)—Negotiations on a reduction of short-range missiles will probably only occur when troop and tank units are broken up after the success of the Vienna disarmament round. By means of this move, which is closer to the U.S. viewpoint, the Federal Government hopes that a unified overall concept will come into being on the part of the alliance by the NATO summit next Monday in Brussels.

The German formulations are due to be passed to the U.S. Government on Monday. Federal Chancellor Helmut Kohl has already announced more explanatory telephone conversations with U.S. President George Bush and other NATO heads of state on Sunday.

The position urged by Washington over the weekend was confirmed for the first time on Monday in Bonn by government spokesman Hans Klein. Speaking to the federal press conference, he conceded that the "speedy negotiations" sought "up to the present" would be changed into "negotiations after first results of implementation" (implement: fulfillment of a contract or treaty.) This "completion" could of course only be implemented after success at the Vienna conventional disarmament talks.

The Federal Government was hoping for as rapid a conclusion as possible. Klein contradicted the suspicion that German-U.S. differences are merely centered on phraseological details. This would be a simplification, the government spokesman said. He thus confirmed the seriousness of the differences which continue to exist. [passage omitted]

SPD Drafts Concept for Missile Elimination
*AU2005122689 Munich SUEDDEUTSCHE ZEITUNG
in German 19 May 89 p 6*

[“ub” report: “SPD Drafts Plan for Missile Elimination”]

[Text] Bonn—According to disarmament expert Egon Bahr, the Social Democratic Party of Germany [SPD] would welcome efforts by the government to persuade NATO to work out a concept by the end of this year on how wars can be made “unwageable” in Europe in the future. There is no doubt that talks with the East on tactical nuclear weapons and short-range missiles must be prepared, Bahr stated in Bonn. According to the SPD disarmament expert, in the controversy with the Anglo-Saxons over the short-range missiles, the government has adopted about 80 percent of the SPD's concept. The only difference is that the coalition is “coasting” to prevent a final decision prior to the Bundestag elections. Those, who vote for the SPD, however, are voting for a “clear no” to the deployment of nuclear missiles, Bahr emphasized.

According to Bahr, Bonn's quarrel with Washington and London is basically due to the fact that the Anglo-Saxons do not believe that wars can be made “unwageable” in Europe through negotiations. However, the goal of German and European policy must be to gradually achieve an inability to attack together with the East, thus overcoming deterrence. The interests of a superpower and those of a medium-sized European power coincide here, Bahr stressed. Bonn is strong because the United States cannot deploy new missiles on German soil without German approval. Washington is strong because Bonn

cannot force negotiations on the United States. A possible compromise may result from this situation.

The SPD's disarmament expert has the following development in mind to ultimately achieve the scrapping of all short-range missiles:

- NATO declares its willingness in principle to hold talks. A Western disarmament concept is developed by the end of the year.
- Negotiations start early next year, on a different legal basis, but in connection with the Vienna talks on conventional stability. The reduction of superiorities is linked with a zero option for tactical nuclear weapons (12-30 km range).
- In a further step, both sides agree on common ceilings for the existing short-range nuclear missiles, which must be clearly below the level of the 88 Western Lance systems. (In Bahr's view, the Lance missiles, whose modernization, including the exchange of motors and other elements, should be concluded by the end of this year, will be operational until the turn of the century.)
- In a third phase of disarmament in Europe, when both sides have reached the structural incapability to attack through reductions and reorganization, all short-range missiles should be eliminated.

Such a concept will be supported by the SPD, Bahr stressed. However, if NATO proves unable to develop a consistent disarmament concept, it will plunge into a serious crisis.

Foreign Minister Genscher Expects Quick Conventional Arms Accords
*LD2005125589 Hamburg DPA in German 1043 GMT
20 May 89*

[Excerpts] Bonn (DPA)—Federal Foreign Minister Hans-Dietrich Genscher expects the Vienna negotiations on conventional weapon disarmament to lead to initial specific agreements “within a relatively short space of time.” Genscher told WELT AM SONNTAG newspaper that these must be steps for reducing the capacity for a surprise attack and a territorial offensive. The “relatively short space of time” could not, however, be measured in terms of “months.”

Genscher avoided answering a question concerning the consequences such a result could have for the nuclear sphere. On this question and the issue of whether nuclear short-range missiles are still necessary if there is a balance in the conventional sphere by 1997, Genscher referred to Federal Chancellor Helmut Kohl's 27 April government statement.

In the statement the chancellor underlined Bonn's demand for early negotiations on a reduction of short-range missiles. [passage omitted]

Defense Minister Gerhard Stoltenberg has just explored possibilities for reaching an agreement in Washington, stating afterwards that views have moved closer together. He will be briefing Federal Chancellor Helmut Kohl about his talks in Washington tomorrow. Genscher will also be taking part in the talk.

Bundestag President Suessmuth Stresses Bonn's Reliability in NATO

AU1905181889 Hamburg *DIE WELT* in German
19 May 89 p 1

[("hrk" report: "No Solo Attempt by Bonn")]

[Text] There is no reason for questioning "the FRG's reliability as an alliance partner" or for speaking of the danger of a "solo attempt by the Germans." This was stressed by Bundestag President Rita Suessmuth (Christian Democratic Union) at an official meeting yesterday [18 May] of the government and the Berlin Senat, held on the occasion of the 40th anniversary of the FRG at the Berlin Reichstag building.

Referring to this issue, which has recently been receiving particular attention abroad, she stressed that this is "an ordinary foreign policy procedure, aimed at seeking a joint security and peace concept among the NATO partners." Regarding far-Right parties, the politician warned emphatically against those who "are losing sight of the whole and want to embark on a nationalist path." She described the "unrestricted yes to democracy as a precondition for freedom of every individual German and the unity of our nation" as the government's credo.

Foreign Minister Genscher Interviewed on 'European Peace Order'

AU2205161189 Hamburg *WELT AM SONNTAG* in German
21 May 89 pp 25-26

[Interview with Foreign Minister Hans-Dietrich Genscher by Manfred Geist and Siegmar Schelling in Bad Reichenhall; date not given: "We Must Create an Order of Peace From the Atlantic to the Urals"]

[Text] [WELT AM SONNTAG] Mr Minister, you have been in office for 15 years now. Do you know whether any foreign minister has been in office for longer than you?

[Genscher] Yes, I do. They are the foreign ministers of Kuwait and Bulgaria. You notice such things.

[WELT AM SONNTAG] Since when have you been aware of this fact?

[Genscher] Since about my 10th year in office.

[WELT AM SONNTAG] What has been your greatest success during your term of office?

[Genscher] I see two politically important results of German foreign policy: The breakthrough within the European Community in the direction of the European Union and, regarding East-West relations, the beginning of a disarmament phase as a result of the INF Treaty, the Stockholm conference on confidence-building measures, and the resumption of negotiations on conventional stability. The CSCE process has become a great success for all of Europe.

[WELT AM SONNTAG] What has been your most bitter disappointment?

[Genscher] You are always bitterly disappointed when you are unable to help people. We are confronted with a great many human problems when we try to help people to leave their country, when we try to achieve their release from prison, or when we try to help people who have been taken hostage—as happened in Lebanon recently.

[WELT AM SONNTAG] What would you see as the decisive goal of your foreign policy?

[Genscher] The decisive idea is for us to strengthen the Western community, which shares the same fate and of which we form a part because we acknowledge democracy and human rights. Based on the European Community and the Western alliance, we must try to create a European peace order from the Atlantic to the Urals.

[WELT AM SONNTAG] Do you see any success in this respect?

[Genscher] After years of stagnation in both the development of the European Community and in East-West relations, we have made major steps forward during the last 2 years. It is interesting that the dynamism in the European Community and in East-West relations are parallel developments, and in the latter case it has been made possible by aspirations for reform in the Soviet Union and other Warsaw Pact states. Europe has started moving. Only those who pursue clear goals in such a phase will carry them out. Those who stumble around without orientation, blinded by the blinkers of the past, will fail with their minds turned toward the past.

[WELT AM SONNTAG] What role does the German-French relationship play in Europe?

[Genscher] It is of vital importance for the integration process within the EC. France and the FRG have become the motor of European integration. We are always a step ahead of developments in the EC. Now we have created the German-French Security and Defense Council as well as the Economic and Finance Council. The European NATO partners must create their security policy identity within the Western European Union [WEU] which has been revitalized by France and Germany. The monetary policy dimension of the EC must be created with the currency union and the European central bank

system. That will be the moment of truth regarding every EC partner's will to bring about integration.

[WELT AM SONNTAG] Will the Community be a closed society, or will it remain open to others?

[Genscher] It is immensely attractive to the outside world. I claim that the impression it produces externally is greater than the impression it produces internally, which entails the risk, however, that it underestimates itself and is overestimated by the outside world. This concerns the opportunities that other partners have and the dangers that they believe they see. Of course, the EC must be open. However, it must be clear that membership is only possible with all the rights and duties that this involves. There can be no membership of different quality.

[WELT AM SONNTAG] Would it be possible for Hungary, for instance, to become a member in a few years?

[Genscher] The question about developments in other European countries concerns the future, and we should not get lost in speculation, because we must be aware that the EC is not only an economic community, but primarily a community sharing equal values. That means that every step toward the EC, reaching farther than cooperation, naturally also requires an answer to the question as to whether a given country shares our value concepts and our political goals.

[WELT AM SONNTAG] To what extent do you see your foreign policy confirmed by the recent Soviet disarmament proposals?

[Genscher] Very considerably. The most important thing about those proposals is that they take into consideration the Western offers for conventional stability. That is a German foreign policy success. After all, we have always stressed the crucial problem of European security—achieving conventional stability—and have finally convinced the Western alliance. We also have always addressed the problem of the East's considerable superiority in short-range missiles. There is no arms area in which the East is more superior.

[WELT AM SONNTAG] If it turned out to be possible to really achieve conventional parity between the Eastern and Western alliances, would those short-range nuclear systems still be required which have the tactical importance of stopping the second echelon of a potential attacker, which must then cease to exist?

[Genscher] The federal chancellor expounded the German position on this in his government statement of 27 April.

[WELT AM SONNTAG] Does the fact that the Soviet Union has considered the Western ideas about conventional stability not show that criticism about NATO in the West was precipitated?

[Genscher] It does indeed. NATO's proposals were partly called insufficient and unrealistic. It turns out now that, like us, the East considers them realistic. I am convinced that if the Vienna negotiations on bilateral conventional disarmament are conducted responsibly and are oriented toward success, we will be able to reach initial specific accords within a relatively short time—even though this cannot be measured in months. There will have to be steps to reduce the ability to launch surprise attacks and large-scale offensives.

[WELT AM SONNTAG] What consequences could result from this in the nuclear area?

[Genscher] That is also answered by the federal chancellor's government statement.

[WELT AM SONNTAG] Is the impression entirely wrong that the negotiations in Vienna are making better headway than has been assumed by the public?

[Genscher] This impression is correct. As you know, in the past I have also always said that it is my impression that the Soviet side has an interest in concrete results in conventional disarmament. By the way, here it also turns out that the West has taken the initiative by presenting its disarmament concept. France and the Federal Republic suggested conventional negotiations at the NATO foreign ministers meeting in Halifax in 1986. We see our policy confirmed by developments.

[WELT AM SONNTAG] How do you assess the warning of Soviet Foreign Minister Shevardnadze during his recent visit to Bonn, that Moscow will not remain inactive if the Western short-range nuclear systems are modernized?

[Genscher] We should stress our expectations that the Soviet Union will reduce its superiority in this area.

[WELT AM SONNTAG] Does Gorbachev want the denuclearization of Europe, as some people claim in the West, including U.S. Secretary of State Baker in his recent statement?

[Genscher] I keep to what we have said in the alliance—namely, that we have a strategy that is required for a foreseeable time. This strategy includes conventional as well as nuclear elements to deter war.

[WELT AM SONNTAG] Does Gorbachev's European home mean something to you?

[Genscher] We in the West want to have an order in which the nations can exercise their right to self-determination, in other words, in which they can live as they deem proper; an order in which human rights are valid, in which the nations work for their mutual benefit on the basis of arms control, disarmament, and dialogue, and do not threaten each other. If this is what the term "common European home" means, there are really equal

goals. Perhaps this is just a different name for what we said in the alliance in 1967 when we demanded a European peace order from the Atlantic to the Urals. We had to wait 20 years for a favorable response from the East. Now, for the first time, we have an opportunity to make steps forward on this road.

[WELT AM SONNTAG] In the course of the disarmament process, the legitimacy of the Bundeswehr has also become an issue. What justification do you see for the Bundeswehr in this process?

[Genscher] To begin with, we must analyze what the Bundeswehr is doing. The service that the Bundeswehr soldiers perform is a service for freedom and peace. Together with our allies, the Bundeswehr preserves peace for all of Europe and freedom for us. The Bundeswehr will also have its task and its mission in a European peace order with additional cooperative security structures. As far as we can see, there will be no world without soldiers, but under a European peace order the forces of the individual countries will fulfill their tasks to create stability and prevent war under new conditions.

Acceptance of the Bundeswehr will be all the greater, the more the public is convinced that we resolutely use the disarmament opportunities. We owe this above all to our soldiers. We have an army of conscripts—something that others do not have. It is also important that policy, which gives the Bundeswehr its mandate, does not shift the public representation of this mandate onto the soldiers. That also holds true for exercises and maneuvers. It is not the soldiers but policy which has to represent their mandate and its consequences toward the public. I think that compulsory military service is the expression of a democratic state's legitimate will to defend. I believe that the decision to introduce compulsory military service was correct and continues to be correct, because our Bundeswehr is not a state within a state, but part of our society.

[WELT AM SONNTAG] In the light of this understanding, could you not reassess the problem of the Bundeswehr's being assigned to the United Nations Organization?

[Genscher] Owing to its attitude and the quality of its training, the Bundeswehr is particularly qualified to fulfill peace tasks in the framework of the United Nations Organization. However, so far every Federal Government has held the view that the Basic Law does not permit a Bundeswehr mission outside NATO. You cannot simply throw such an interpretation of the law overboard, nor can you deal with such a problem by means of something vague in the Constitution, to say the least. In the interest of our soldiers and in the interest of the legitimacy of the Bundeswehr mandate, constitutional clarity regarding the Armed Forces is required. That means that, if we want the Bundeswehr to serve in the scope of UN peace tasks, we must create the relevant constitutional conditions.

[WELT AM SONNTAG] In Davos in 1987 you demanded that Gorbachev be taken seriously, that he be taken at his word....

[Genscher] I do not have to take anything back. However, my critics at that time have meanwhile had to take back many of their statements.

[WELT AM SONNTAG] Would you dispute that there is also a certain suspicion among serious U.S. politicians and the press—suspicion about the Germans and their reliability?

[Genscher] Considering the development of public opinion in the United States during the past 3 weeks, I clearly see that understanding for our position is growing. I never expected it to be different. I have said that as soon as we start to discuss things—that was only possible after we had formulated our position—they will change their minds very quickly. I understand that more than two-thirds of the Americans today are in favor of negotiations on short-range missiles, and this almost corresponds to the figures in our country. By the way, all those who are familiar with the situation know that the West's conventional defensive capability is essentially based on the FRG. Together with the United States, we make the largest contribution to Western security by far.

[WELT AM SONNTAG] Gorbachev will be coming to Bonn in 4 weeks. What do you expect from this visit?

[Genscher] That we formulate the prospects of German-Soviet relations. That will lead to new quality relations. That is good for us. It is good for the Soviet Union, and it is good for Europe. A look back proves that German-Soviet relations are of central importance for the situation in Europe. Without the Moscow Treaty, there would not have been the Basic Treaty with the GDR, nor the Warsaw Treaty, nor the treaty with the CSSR, nor the Berlin agreement, nor the Helsinki Final Act. The relationship between Bonn and Moscow is of central importance. Seen this way, the improvement of our relations with the Soviet Union serves not only German, but also European interests.

[WELT AM SONNTAG] It is conceivable that Gorbachev could make a surprising statement in Bonn, such as a statement on the Germans' right to self-determination, the Wall, or even reunification?

[Genscher] I do not hold with speculators or speculation.

[WELT AM SONNTAG] In this connection, how do you view the development of what people call the German problem?

[Genscher] I do not think that it has ever been as obvious as it is today that the German fate cannot be isolated from the European fate. The border across Europe is the border across Germany. Every improvement in East-West relations primarily benefits those who suffer from

this border more than others. French President Mitterrand has said that the Europeans' great task is to overcome the division of Europe by the end of this century. I can only say that we also agree with France on this problem. It is important for us that a man with the historic vision of Mitterrand fully agrees with us on this concept. Every attempt to de-Europeanize the German fate would be bound to end up in the blind alley of a lone national action, in a dangerous nationalism that would destabilize Europe, and in the distrust of all our neighbors.

[WELT AM SONNTAG] Could the visit also have consequences for intra-German relations?

[Genscher] Only favorable ones. Experience has shown that the intra-German relations cannot be much better than the German-Soviet relations.

[WELT AM SONNTAG] How do you view the role of the Free Democratic Party of Germany [FDP] which has always claimed that it holds a center position, in view of the fact that the fringe groups are currently so vociferous in German politics?

[Genscher] At any rate, if the fringe groups are so vociferous, the center must clearly show its profile. That means that it must clearly show its goals, ideas, and plans. In the FDP we are all doing this.

[WELT AM SONNTAG] Does the emergence of the fringe groups have to do with the decline in the big people's parties, as predicted by you?

[Genscher] There is no doubt that we had a trend toward mass society for many decades. Today, the changes in production conditions are leading to more and more individual work areas and decisions. People have more leisure time. Owing to new media, there are better information possibilities. We are about to become an information society. All this furthers the people's will to assume more personal responsibility. The road from a mass society [Vermassung] to an individualist society [Entmassung] also leads to the termination of traditional political bonds. That is the problem of the big parties, but it is also a great opportunity for the liberals.

[WELT AM SONNTAG] Can you conceive of six parties in the Bundestag, following parliamentary elections in 1990?

[Genscher] It is impossible to predict that now. We can only say this much: If democratic parties, in a sort of adjustment opportunism, were to try to run after fringe parties, this would be the best way to bring fringe parties into the Bundestag. Therefore, I can only emphatically warn about twisting the inner axis of our republic into some direction or another.

[WELT AM SONNTAG] Can you conceive of the present coalition continuing after 1990?

[Genscher] Why not?

SPD's Vogel, Bahr on Compromise With U.S.

*LD2205102989 Hamburg DPA in German 0936 GMT
22 May 89*

[Text] Bonn (DPA)—SPD Chairman Hans-Jochen Vogel, speaking on Monday on Radio Saarland/Saarlaendischer Rundfunk, described the alleged missiles compromise between Bonn and Washington as "a lot of noise about nothing." SPD disarmament expert Egon Bahr said that the U.S. demand to negotiate on short-range missiles only after firm results on conventional disarmament have been obtained and implemented, is "completely unacceptable". This would mean a delay of 4-6 years, "if everything goes very well," Bahr estimated on Monday on Deutschlandfunk (radio).

Vogel stressed his party's 'no' position on any kind of counterarmament. The SPD wants the "third zero solution in stages." Agreements on common lower maximums for short-range missiles could represent a reasonable intermediate step in this process, the SPD leader said.

Bahr stressed that the Americans cannot compel the Federal Republic on the introduction of new missiles. However, Bonn cannot force the Americans into negotiations on short-range missiles.

'Quarrel' With Washington on Missiles Continues

*AU2305192289 Frankfurt/Main FRANKFURTER
ALLGEMEINE in German 23 May 89 pp 1-2*

[Report by "C.G.": "Bonn Insists on Negotiations in Foreseeable Time"]

[Text] Bonn, 22 May—A week prior to the Brussels NATO meeting and U.S. President Bush's visit to the Federal Republic, the quarrel between Bonn and Washington over missiles is continuing. Federal Chancellor Kohl sent Bush a cable on Monday [22 May] in response to a paper in which the U.S. Administration, in talks with Defense Minister Stoltenberg on Friday last week [19 May], expounded its ideas about the preconditions for negotiations on short-range missiles with the Soviet Union. No rapprochement has been achieved by the exchange of letters on the decisive point, the timing of the beginning of such negotiations. The Federal Government originally said it wanted "negotiations soon" between the United States and the Soviet Union on the subject of short-range missiles. Washington and London at first did not want negotiations to come about at all, if possible, and finally said that there would only be negotiations if results had been achieved in other areas of disarmament. In the text that Stoltenberg discussed with Kohl and Foreign Minister Genscher in Bonn on Sunday [21 May], the United States demands not only the conclusion of the Vienna negotiations on conventional stability from the Atlantic to the Urals, but also the implementation of a corresponding agreement. In

agreement with Genscher, Stoltenberg, and the Christian Social Union [CSU], Kohl says in his answer that the Federal Government cannot agree to an approach that is tantamount to the postponement of East-West missile negotiations for an unforeseeable length of time. Commenting on the U.S. position, a person involved in the discussions told this newspaper: "They cannot do this with the Federal Republic." He added that Bonn insists on the proposal to bring about negotiations in a foreseeable period of time.

After having sent his cable, Kohl tried to reach understanding with Bush in a telephone conversation. On Monday [22 May] evening, the federal chancellor also discussed the way to deal with the missile issue within the scope of the planned overall NATO concept with Spanish Prime Minister Gonzalez, who was in Bonn to prepare for the European Council meeting in Madrid in June. Genscher was in Brussels, trying to reach agreement with the foreign ministers of the other 11 EC countries on a compromise solution to the missile issue. Bonn considers Great Britain to be more hard-line on this matter than the United States.

The hopeful statements of Presidents Bush and Mitterrand on Sunday [21 May] about the possibility of agreement within the alliance prior to the Brussels meeting were received with caution in Bonn. "We are not yet over the hill," sources in Bonn said. They added that the Federal Government will continue to try to achieve agreement, step by step. Like Kohl, Bush "pledged" that efforts are being made to settle the matter, these sources said. Bonn sources indicated that the U.S. formula about the "implementation" of a Vienna conventional arms agreement prior to the beginning of missile negotiations has been assessed as an unreasonable demand.

However, the Federal Government apparently agrees to the modification—requested by Washington—of a sentence in the Bonn coalition decision to postpone the decision on modernizing short-range missiles. The sentence originally said that a decision should be made in 1992 on whether "or not" it would be necessary to introduce and consequently produce and deploy a Lance follow-up system in the alliance in 1996. Washington wants to have the two words "or not" canceled to rule out the possibility of a third zero solution. Sources in Bonn said that the words "or not" only reflected what was said earlier in the same statement and were therefore unnecessary.

Following talks with U.S. Ambassador Walters, Alfred Dregger, Christian Democratic Union/Christian Social Union Bundestag floor leader, said that "quite a bit of work" must still be done "before we will have reached a common alliance position on a disarmament initiative in the short-range area to overcome the Soviet Union's superiority in this field." The Germans cannot accept this Soviet superiority, he said, adding: "Therefore, it must be our goal to reduce armaments on both sides to a

minimum level necessary for deterrence—in other words, to common upper ceilings under the present NATO stocks."

Egon Bahr, presidium member of the Social Democratic Party of Germany [SPD], said that the U.S. position, whereby negotiations would begin only "after the accords reached in Vienna on the first disarmament step have been implemented," is unacceptable. He said that such a position represented a postponement of negotiations by at least 4–6 years. Horst Ehmke, SPD Bundestag deputy floor leader, reproached the Federal Government for "yielding" to Washington.

CDU's Dregger Sees NATO 'Consensus' on SNF Reduction Still Possible

*LD2405111889 Hamburg DPA in German 1022 GMT
24 May 89*

[Text] Bonn (DPA)—In the opinion of Alfred Dregger, chairman of the CDU/CSU [Christian Democratic Union/Christian Social Union] parliamentary group in the lower house, NATO does "not absolutely" have to reach a compromise on the missile dispute prior to its summit meeting in Brussels next week. Dregger said on Deutschlandfunk radio Wednesday that he does, however, think a consensus is still possible.

But he said that a compromise depends on the fundamental agreement of the NATO partners to negotiations on the reduction of short-range missiles. On this point the alliance has to regard the "vital security interests of the Germans." The Germans are those mainly affected when there is a threat to use this type of weapon.

In Dregger's view, during negotiations on the reduction of short-range missiles to equal ceilings, a third zero solution can be ruled out "right from the start as unnegotiable at the moment." But Dregger makes it clear that a complete renunciation of short-range missiles can become a long-term objective.

The CDU politician also commented on the Warsaw Pact proposal that the military alliances be disbanded. Before such a step, the Soviet Union will have to release its allies in East and central Europe from their "satellite status" and restore the Germans' right to self-determination.

Kohl Receives Further U.S. Message on Missiles

*LD2405182589 Hamburg DPA in German 1752 GMT
24 May 89*

[Text] Bonn (DPA)—The Federal Chancellor's Office reported this evening in response to questions, that Federal Chancellor Kohl today received a further communication from the U.S. President on the subject of the missiles. He hopes to reply to this letter today. Just this past Monday [22 May] Kohl sent new German formulations to Washington in response to the U.S. demands.

A telephone conversation planned for today between the two politicians did not, however, take place, according to government statements. No reasons were given. The chancellor has, however, had telephone conversations over the past few days with several European allies, including French President Francois Mitterrand.

FDP's Schaefer Supports Early Missile Talks
AU2405171789 Munich SUEDDEUTSCH ZEITUNG
in German 24 May 89 p 2

[Report by Stephan-Andreas Casdorff: "Schaefer: 'Better Distribution of Risks Within NATO'"]

[Text] Helmut Schaefer (Free Democratic Party), state minister in the Foreign Ministry, calls for the better distribution of the "risks" within NATO that result from the deployment of nuclear missiles for some countries, particularly for the FRG. Schaefer asked why the Germans should have to bear the greatest risk in Europe. In a talk with SUEDDEUTSCHE ZEITUNG on Tuesday [23 May], he pointed out that even after a possible elimination of land-based systems, NATO and the U.S. forces in Germany would not be unprotected. After all, there is still the possibility of so-called air-based nuclear systems, he said.

The state minister stressed that Bernard Rogers, former NATO commander in chief for Europe, at a recent German-American meeting in Detroit rejected the claim that, because of their greater vulnerability, air-based systems—standoff weapons on board aircraft—are less suited for deterrence than land-based ones. In Schaefer's view it would be in accordance with the concept of NATO that new air-based systems are not only deployed in the FRG, but that several European states are involved.

Schaefer stressed the difficult psychological situation in the FRG. He said that he thinks that the FRG citizens will no longer accept an absence of negotiations on the Soviet superiority in the field of land-based short-range nuclear missiles, and instead a simple deployment of new systems on German soil. The Germans would no longer understand such a line of action, Schaefer stated. One will have to discuss how one can reduce the imbalance of 88 Western Lance systems compared to approximately 1,600 systems on the side of the East. The state minister said that he recently explained this position to several people in the United States, and that he met with understanding, particularly from influential members of Congress in Washington.

Schaefer reiterated that the negotiations on land-based short-range nuclear weapons must not be delayed for too long. He said that in an initial phase, joint lower ceilings should be agreed upon with the USSR. This would be valid as long as the USSR did not drastically reduce its conventional strength. However, if the USSR should indeed be prepared to reduce its invasion- and offensive capability, a third zero option involving land-based

short-range nuclear missiles cannot be completely excluded, he said. After all, these would then be superfluous as a counterforce, he said.

To wait until all the Vienna talks on conventional disarmament are concluded for negotiations on short-range weapons to take place is much too long a period, Schaefer said. One must not apply too high a standard, the state minister said, adding that in his view certain interim results in Vienna would justify the beginning of new missile negotiations. The Vienna interim results would not necessarily have to be fully implemented, he said, but their implementation should at least have started. Schaefer did not exclude that this might be achieved as early as in a year's time.

Gorbachev's 'Public Diplomacy' Seen as Impeding Negotiations
AU2405151089 Frankfurt/Main FRANKFURTER
ALLGEMEINE in German 24 May 89 p 1

[["Nm." editorial: "A Double Strategy"]]

[Text] The East's proposal to dissolve the two alliance systems will not meet with the West's approval. It is apparent that the problem does not lie in politico-military organizations, but in the controversial situation in Europe which led to their establishment. Moreover, the proposal is so old that it causes the suspicion of things being brought up again for propaganda reasons only. At any rate, the U.S. Administration's annoyance that Gorbachev has usurped the position of a single entertainer in world politics is increasing. If he does this too frequently, while presenting initiatives that are wanting in seriousness, this could cloud relations between Washington and Moscow.

Yet the Soviet Union does not need to organize a permanent spectacle. At the Vienna negotiations on the reduction of conventional armed forces [CFE] in Europe it has submitted proposals to which the Western side reacted positively. Even skeptics conceded soon after the beginning of these talks that Moscow is "aiming at results." In this disarmament round, the subject of which is of central importance to the West, more has been achieved after a few weeks than in almost 15 years of negotiations on "mutual balanced force reduction" (MBFR) in the same place. However, rumors spread by the Eastern side that the CFE negotiations may be concluded before the end of the year are untrustworthy. The problems will only start when there is agreement on global figures, that is, when negotiations on individual weapons categories, timetables, and verification will be required. Moreover, the Warsaw Pact is still trying to overburden the negotiations with discussions on nuclear weapons and naval and air forces. Although all this is somehow related, there have to be separate negotiations.

Gorbachev's double strategy of exerting pressure on Western governments by "public diplomacy" and conducting serious negotiations at the same time has

reached a critical stage. If the Kremlin leader is serious about disarmament, he should curb his delight in the controversies into which he has plunged NATO. For the unrenounceable prerequisite for further treaties is not a dispute, but unity in the West.

FRANCE

President Mitterrand Discusses SNF, Nuclear Testing at Press Conference
*LD1805182889 Paris Domestic Service in French
1400 GMT 18 May 89*

[News conference given by President Francois Mitterrand in Paris on 18 May—live]

[Excerpts] [Mitterrand] Ladies and gentlemen, thank you for coming. Press conferences of this style have become rather rare. I seem to have heard that this has been a cause of complaint. It is certain that this is a good occasion to have before me so many journalists and representatives of the press of all disciplines, both from France and from foreign countries, and this occasion also provides me with the opportunity to reply to your questions on matters which are serious in the essence—namely, France's foreign policy and, consequently, its security policy.

I would like to set out in a few words the problems I intend to deal with in depth with you, while asking you to feel free to ask any question you like. But if I may be allowed to apply some logic to our meeting, we could follow the plan which I am going to set before you.

France's first objective is to contribute to the defense of peace, which presumes that disarmament must be speeded up in all reasonable circumstances. This can only contribute to reducing tensions. Within this framework there must be debate. I could tell you how France itself has proposed, accepted, and, in any case, discussed with its partners the problems relating to disarmament—what has been done, what remains to be done, and this is the larger part.

The second point attached to this heading of the defense of peace is what, for those who are accustomed to meet me in this kind of exercise, I usually call balance. There cannot be disarmament without balance in the reduction of forces. Balance is a notion which is often subtle; it cannot simply be settled in quantitative terms. And this means—both for disarmament and for maintaining the balance in disarmament, balance between existing forces—this means in all circumstances negotiating, by negotiation, and therefore never refusing to discuss with one's partners, close or distant, friends or not. [passage omitted]

[Ockrent] Christine Ockrent, Antenne-2. Mr President, the Western bloc appears to be deeply divided over the Gorbachev proposals concerning short-range missiles: the British want to modernize them, the Germans to

negotiate over them, the United States does not want them. What is France's position?

[Mitterrand] My first observation—and it is not a refusal to answer you but it is necessary if we are to understand the subject properly—is that there is at present an internal discussion among the countries belonging to NATO's integrated command. This is already rather obscure terminology: We are members of the Atlantic alliance; we take part in the military alliance but not in the same way as the others. The others have created a military, hierarchical structure—that is what I have called the integrated command, and the main leader of that is the United States.

France is a loyal ally, a full ally: It intends to show solidarity with the alliance, but it is not part of that hierarchy. France intends to carry out its own self-determination in accordance with circumstances. This means that we possess what is called an autonomous strategy, this autonomous strategy being a strategy of deterrence within the general framework of Western deterrence.

Having said that, the discussions between the British, the Americans, and the Germans are discussions which are appropriate to that body which is called the integrated command. We are not involved in that debate, but we can give an opinion. Basically, that is what you are asking for. This is what I did in 1983—and yet we were in the same juridical and military situation—when in Bonn—although, after all, it was not for me to take a greater part than was fitting—when I asked for the installation of the Pershing-2's in response to the installation by the other side of the SS-20's.

And sometimes one hears it said: Well, why do you not act like that? Has the time really come for that? That means that the debate among the partners concerned in this discussion is far from being closed. Let us not reach a conclusion too quickly. It is true that it was very rapidly posed as an urgent principle from the very beginning that it would be right to modernize the very short-range nuclear weapons right away, soon, so it had to be decided now. But the Germans, who were not keen on this, demonstrated clearly that they did not wish to step up the pace. The United States, like Great Britain, wished to take a decision quite rapidly. But at the present time I am quite satisfied—because I find this reasonable—to see that the Americans and the Germans seem to have considered that if there is to be modernization—I will tell you in what conditions I think it will be necessary—one should wait to discuss it between now and at least 1992, that date being the point after which there would be ageing [of the weapons] and hence an imbalance.

Certain people say that there are already imbalances, and that is possible. That is to say, before the opening of this discussion the Soviets might already have proceeded with the modernization of their own weapons of the

same type. There has to be a discussion on that. We shall have it in Brussels in a few days' time. One has to be in a position to verify the real state of the USSR's modernized forces. Any modernization on one side would automatically give rise to modernization on the other. And that is not the only argument. I think that one has to have a clear mind in this area and to know what one is attacking. I said during the last NATO meeting, which was also held in Brussels, I said on behalf of France that it seemed to me to be essential to give priority to conventional disarmament, that after the first reductions effected by the Russians and the Americans—and that was a matter which concerned them in view of their enormous power, which does not compare with that of the others, including our own—they should make a much more important effort. But in the end they did, all the same, decide on the abolition of the so-called intermediate, medium-range weapons in Europe. Very good! I approved of that and I was not the only one, but I approved it wholeheartedly [words indistinct].

And I remember having said: Let us set a time-limit, notably with the Warsaw Pact, in order for real discussion, negotiations, to be started on the reduction in conventional weapons, balanced at the lowest possible level. That time limit should be 2-3 years—I mentioned these precise figures—and in those years, that is before 1992, before the very short-range weapons become outdated, we shall see whether negotiations not only have opened but whether they have made progress, with priority going to conventional disarmament while signs of mutual goodwill will have been given. One will be able to begin examining the question of the short-range missiles. If nothing is done, if there is a refusal to take concrete, precise, real decisions in the field of conventional weapons—well, one will indeed have to modernize. That is to say that after having lived for a few years with the idea that disarmament is on the threshold, we would have to admit that it was an illusion, that one had halted along the path, one will have to take the appropriate measures to ensure the security of the alliance.

That is why I do not believe—and if I am mistaken, we shall know about it—I do not believe that the Brussels negotiations are crucial [dramatique] negotiations. I think that the United States, Germany, Great Britain, and all the others will allow time for thought since there is no technical urgency. But if you insist on knowing definitions of principle—I would say that I am one of those who thinks that the time has not yet come—far from it—when one could say: a third zero option. God knows I supported the first option and the second option. But this would mean the disappearance of all nuclear forces, in the case of the alliance, in central Europe on the Western side, while some 10,000 nuclear warheads exist on the Soviet side and while the reduction announced by Mr Gorbachev would only affect 5 percent of those forces as a whole.

So, everyone has to make his contribution. If it is necessary to modernize, let us do that. How will we know

whether it is necessary? First, we have the time limit of 1992—that is the date after which we would risk getting behind. And then let us examine the points which we will have reached on conventional or classical disarmament. Those are the conditions which I would lay down if I were to participate in the Brussels decision, in the meeting of the allies. [passage omitted]

[Unidentified correspondent] I wanted to ask you: Could France not contribute to disarmament by renouncing everything that is not necessary for its defense and security, for example the nuclear tests in the Pacific, by halting the manufacture of the Hades tactical missile and its payload, the neutron bomb—or again, for example, by abandoning its program for a new generation of strategic submarines?

[Mitterand] I will give you a very simple answer. If the United States and the Soviet Union abandon them—and Great Britain—we shall go this way. I am ready to stop all nuclear tests immediately, knowing that it is these tests which enable us to have weapons capable of keeping us on the threshold of credibility necessary for us. We carry out far fewer tests than the Soviet Union, much fewer than the United States of America. Asking for an end to nuclear tests is asking for France to stop having nuclear weapons. Well, let those who take this road go so far as to ask for the elimination of all nuclear weapons—including the strategic ones, naturally—of the two greatest powers in the world.

We are not in love with nuclear weapons. Not at all! It just so happens that this decisive means of destruction has held the balance of peace between the two military blocs for 40 years. It happens to be in the hands of the great powers, especially of the Soviet Union, on the European Continent. I do not see why France should deprive itself of the minimum means, on the very threshold of what we need, thus exposing itself, losing the very trump card that enables it to sit where it does sit. It should be understood that we have not decided to let fate make the decision. Why? Why ask France what is not asked of others. If it is asked of others it can rightfully be asked of France. In this case France will take it into account.

In 1983 I set out what the conditions would be at the United Nations. The Soviet and U.S. strategic weapons should reach a level, the lowest point of which establishes a more or less reasonable comparison between what the French weapons which are adequate for our defense represent—which is between 300 and 400 nuclear warheads—and the Soviet weapons which number more than 10,000. The same for the United States. Thus, if this is carried out by the two greatest powers, who have already talked about it at Reykjavik, we shall review the question.

I also said that likewise the same effort must be made in the case of chemical weapons. The effort is being made, following the French initiative, since the international

conference, which was a great success, was held on our territory and the work in Geneva resumed. France has now also been instructed to lead, let us say, to see these negotiations through. We are not delaying over disarmament. If you say, are you ready to get rid of what is useless for defense, I will tell you yes. But then you immediately choose an example which shows that you consider the defense, France's autonomous deterrence, to be useless. Well, here I cannot go along with you. I could only follow you under the conditions I have just explained.

You mentioned the Hades missiles. It is true that the purpose of the Hades missiles needed defining. This what I have done. The Hades can only be a weapon of last warning. They cannot be a theater or battle weapon. In the meantime they are intended to replace the Pluton missiles, which have a range which ends a short distance from our borders with the FRG, while the Hades can reach substantial distances, but sufficiently limited not to exceed 500 km. This is likely to place them, at least in the view of our allies even if it is not our view, within the negotiations which were successful on medium-range nuclear weapons. In short, now that the possible use of the Hades has been well defined as a weapon of warning, not a battle weapon, we come back quite simply to the comparison between strategic weapons, and the U.S. and Soviet strategic forces must be considerably reduced before this conversation can continue. [passage omitted]

France's position is a position basically in defense of peace, a position of building Europe, a position for the economic and all other sorts of development in the world, beginning with putting an end to the indebtedness of the poor countries, for justice in the world, respect for human rights and respect for the right of people to self-determination. France, in addition to all that, is determined to maintain its position, to defend its interests and security. Is all that not logical, does that not form a whole? I leave as judge of that, first, those who do me the honor of listening to me, and I leave as judge of that the opinion of the French people and international public opinion. Thank you.

SPAIN

Prime Minister Gonzalez Calls Gorbachev Offer on SNF 'Insufficient'
PM1805153089 Madrid YA in Spanish 14 May 89 p 8

[*"A.L.A."* report: "Gonzalez: 'Gorbachev's Offer Insufficient'"]

[Excerpt] La Toja—Prime Minister Felipe Gonzalez asserted yesterday that the arms reduction offer made by Soviet leader Mikhail Gorbachev "is rather insufficient as a reduction offer for it to produce a desirable effect on the Atlantic alliance's part." This statement was made by Gonzalez at a meeting which the Bilderberg Group is holding in La Toja and at which issues such as East European countries' internal evolution, relations

between the United States and the Soviet Union, the EC's long-term economic blueprint, and European sovereignty are being discussed.

Gonzalez, who returned to Madrid yesterday after attending the Bilderberg Group meeting in La Toja, explained that the Soviet leader's proposal cites overall figures, "which are not attributed to anything," and that it includes artillery shells and some gravity bombs, which "are the least important elements." The prime minister stated that he does not believe that this Soviet proposal will change the decisions which should be reached by the special summit of NATO heads of state and government, which will be held in Brussels 29-30 May. "I believe," he said, "that the summit must not, and will not, center on a debate on short-range missiles."

He explained that "it would be absolutely inappropriate," 40 years after the foundation of the Atlantic alliance and "in an international situation such as we are experiencing, if the alliance summit were to be confined to a debate on short-range missiles," and he asserted that this issue will be "a subordinate matter" at the meeting.

Felipe Gonzalez would not specify whether an agreement will be reached at this summit on the modernization of NATO's short-range missiles deployed in Europe; an issue on which there are two conflicting stances, upheld by the United States and the FRG. However, he asserted that from these meetings "you never emerge with a disagreement which would create confrontations; not only because it would not be good for the Western countries as a whole, but also because it would not be good for the development of the Eastern bloc's policy, either."

Prime Minister Gonzalez Discusses SNF with FRG's Kohl on Visit to Bonn

Preview of Talks
LD2205163389 Hamburg DPA in German 1523 GMT 22 May 89

[Text] Bonn (DPA)—Federal Chancellor Helmut Kohl and the Spanish head of government Felipe Gonzalez met today in Bonn for an exchange of opinions. In his capacity as acting EC Council president, Gonzalez is currently making a round of the community partners to improve the chances of a successful EC summit on 26 to 27 June in Madrid.

The talk with Kohl is likely to focus on questions of currency union, tax harmonization, the further development of the internal market and the European social charter. Kohl also hoped to inform Gonzalez of Germany's position in the missile controversy with the United States and Great Britain. In relation to this, the chancellor announced that he had sent a new letter to U.S. President George Bush on 22 May.

The chancellor told the CDU/CSU [Christian Democratic Union/Christian Social Union] party of the Federal Assembly, which meets tomorrow to elect a new head of state, that the Federal Government will do all in its power to help strengthen NATO. Only a strong alliance can ensure peace and freedom. "We are not in favor of a third zero option or the denuclearization of Europe." Bonn does, however, advocate negotiations on short-range missiles, which represent a particular problem for Germans.

Kohl: 'Still in Process of Dialog'
*LD2205192289 Hamburg DPA in German 1745 GMT
22 May 89*

[Excerpts] Bonn (DPA)—Federal Chancellor Helmut Kohl and Spanish head of government Felipe Gonzalez have reached agreement on important issues relating to the EC and NATO. This was stated by both politicians after a meeting in Bonn Monday [22 May]. The FRG capital was the first stop for Gonzalez on a tour of the capitals of the Community prior to the EC summit in Madrid on 26 and 27 June.

Kohl told journalists afterward that he had also talked to Gonzalez about the NATO summit in Brussels next week. During the talk, the view was expressed that the governments of the two countries have a shared interest in an agreed and convincing decision for an overall NATO strategy. Kohl would not give any details. "We are still in the process of dialogue, also with our partners in NATO."

The chancellor announced that on Monday he sent U.S. President George Bush a letter setting out German ideas on the solution of the missile dispute. He intends to talk to Bush about this on the telephone in the next few days. He also refused to comment on this point, as the dialogue is still going on. Gonzalez reminded his audience that at the time he supported the FRG Government on counterarming. He took a lot of criticism for this. "In the meantime the winds from the East are blowing a little differently." The NATO summit in Brussels is of great political importance.

Asked about U.S. threats to withdraw U.S. troops from Europe if there is a third zero solution, Kohl said that Bonn is interested in a strong alliance. The FRG is contributing to this, even when it means making sacrifices. U.S. soldiers in the FRG are also defending the freedom of the United States. He had "not picked up" such threats from leading members of the American government. [passage omitted]

Gonzalez: NATO Summits a Great Opportunity
*LD2205205889 Madrid DPA in Spanish
1800 GMT 22 May 89*

[Excerpts] [Announcer] In the FRG this afternoon Prime Minister Felipe Gonzalez opened his diplomatic offensive to make a success of the Community summit in

Madrid at the end of June, which will be the culmination of Spain's EEC Presidency. His talks with West German Chancellor Helmut Kohl sought points of coincidence on building Europe. For details we go over to two radio correspondents who are in Bonn right now, Jesus Martinez and Antonio Casado.

[Casado] Judging by the smiles there does not appear to be a single cause of disagreement, however small, between current EC President Felipe Gonzalez and FRG Chancellor Helmut Kohl. The good understanding and excellent cooperation I have always had with Felipe Gonzalez is not just of the present, it has always been so, said Kohl. Therefore, he continued, I will do everything possible for the Community summit in Madrid to be a success. The chancellor's good words for Spain's performance in the Community's presidency were immediately repaid by Felipe Gonzalez. [passage omitted]

[Casado] The other major subject of the talks between Kohl and Gonzalez, which resumed after the news conference, was the controversy on short-range missiles. Jesus Martinez.

[Martinez] Both Prime Minister Gonzalez and Chancellor Kohl said that it is a question of seeking political cooperation at an important moment for the Atlantic Alliance.

[Begin Gonzalez recording] But undoubtedly it is a great political opportunity for a summit of the Atlantic alliance, in a new dimension of East-West relations, and I hope that the meeting of the alliance will be equal to this new world situation we are experiencing. [end recording]

[Martinez] For the sake of this world situation and of solidarity among the allies, a compromise is in effect being sought in the few days remaining before the NATO summit in Brussels. To this end, Chancellor Kohl announced at the news conference that he had written a letter to U.S. President Bush, but he refused to give details, although one can assume he will have informed Prime Minister Gonzalez, who repeated his support for the German position, even in the knowledge that he may be criticized, but not as much as when he said in the same place 6 years ago that he understood the deployment of the intermediate-range missiles. Today Kohl did not wish to make any connection between the modernization of the short-range ones and the presence of U.S. Forces in Europe and neither did Felipe Gonzalez, who would not wish the subject to be on the NATO agenda.

[Begin Gonzalez recording] Probably the most prudent thing is not to bring onto the agenda things which may be on subsequent agendas. I think that would be the reasonable thing. The Atlantic alliance made decisions in Reykjavik; it should uphold them. It made a declaration at a summit a year ago. It should uphold it. This 40th anniversary is a great opportunity to analyze the international situation. [end recording]

UNITED KINGDOM

Defense Secretary Accuses Pact on Chemical, Conventional Arms

LD1805143289 London THE DAILY TELEGRAPH
in English 18 May 89 p 15

[Adela Gooch report: "Glasnost 'Failing To Reach Russia's Chemical Arsenal'"]

[Text] A warning that several Warsaw Pact countries had stocks of Soviet chemical weapons and the capability to produce their own was given yesterday by Mr Younger, Defence Secretary. He was giving evidence to the Commons Defence Select Committee on a White Paper published by his department.

"We feel very strongly that glasnost is not operating in the field of chemical weapons and I do not believe there has been much progress in this field at all," he said.

Intelligence assessments of Warsaw Pact chemical weapon capabilities and deployment were classified, but he outlined the broad thrust of their conclusions.

"We have information extending back over many years showing the Soviet Union did deploy chemical weapons in Eastern Europe.

"The non-Soviet countries have factories well capable of producing chemical agents, and in some cases they have reached production stage."

Mr Younger's prognosis for the outcome of talks which are under way to achieve a world ban on chemical weapons was gloomy. The subject had been raised during Mr Gorbachev's visit to Britain last month but so far there had been no Soviet response.

Mr Younger was more optimistic on conventional weapons reduction talks taking place in Geneva. But he stressed that Britain did not want to deviate from the original agenda, which excluded air and naval forces despite Russian pressure for these now to be incorporated.

He also expressed scepticism about recent Russian announcements of unilateral troop and equipment withdrawals. "It is one thing to announce reductions, another to prove they have happened," he said.

"The Soviet Union claims to have removed 1,000 tanks from East Germany. Clearly something is going on. What is very difficult to see is how much they have destroyed and how much is simply removed to Soviet territory but will remain there intact."

For this reason, NATO had to press ahead with modernisation of short range nuclear weapons, said Mr Younger, citing the specific benefits to West Germany, which is divided on the issue.

Mr Younger agreed with Mr Winston Churchill (C) that NATO would be vulnerable if land-based short range nuclear systems were eliminated, as proposed by Russia, and said air-based defence systems could not compensate for such a withdrawal

NATO, Pact Chiefs Exchange Views on Short-Range Missiles

LD1805160889 London PRESS ASSOCIATION
in English 1415 GMT 18 May 89

[By Charles Miller, PRESS ASSOCIATION defence correspondent]

[Text] The insistence of Mrs Thatcher and President Bush on the need to modernise NATO's short-range nuclear weapons could drag Europe into another arms race, the Warsaw Pact's Military commander warned in London today.

General Petr Lushev told the Royal United Services Institute [RUSI] any move to replace NATO's 88 Lance Launchers with a more potent system could become a major obstacle in the Vienna conventional arms talks. But, while he was insistent that the issue of short-range weapons should be addressed immediately, his tone was more conciliatory than that of Soviet political leaders in recent days who have tried to link success in Vienna with a start on talks to cut short-range systems. He acknowledged the Soviet Union would like to extend the scope of the Vienna talks to cover not just tanks, artillery and armoured personnel carriers but also strike aircraft and tactical nuclear weapons. "But we understand that these negotiations involve certain difficulties and for that reason we are not linking one with the other," said General Lushev.

Mrs Thatcher and the US Administration have repeatedly ruled out negotiations to reduce short-range weapons which are viewed as an integral part of NATO's strategy of flexible response.

But Gen Lushev told the audience of leading figures in world defence: "In the not too distant future, the problem of tactical nuclear weapons may become a major obstacle in the way of the Vienna talks unless it is addressed now." He added: "These weapons are closely interwoven with conventional armed forces, basically in the operational and organisational sense. Without the reduction and subsequent elimination of tactical nuclear weapons, it is hardly possible to speak seriously about the elimination of the threat of war."

The modernisation being discussed by NATO involved the development of new medium-range missiles similar to those being eliminated in the Soviet Union under the INF Treaty such as the SS-23. "It might lead to a departure from the INF Treaty and to the emergence of a dangerous situation," he said. "Europe can once again find itself drawn into an arms race with all the ensuing negative consequences."

But the head of NATO's military committee General Wolfgang Altenberg, who followed General Lushev to the podium, left the door open on the question of negotiations. "My father always told me never to say never," he said. "It's a question of timing and intelligence."

General Lushev denied Soviet tactical nuclear weapons had been modernised and described the SS-21 as a "very ordinary" missile with a range of no more than 70 kilometres.

The RUSI conference marked the first meeting between the military commanders in chief of the Warsaw Pact and NATO.

NATO's supreme allied commander in Europe, General John Galvin, was replying to General Lushev later today. It is General Lushev's first visit to the West.

The two military commanders warmly shook hands for the media after a quiet chat over tea. Gen Lushev said: "We hope this first meeting will be followed by stronger contacts and ties which will serve to strengthen confidence and trust between East and West."

Gen Galvin agreed that more talks on military subjects were needed. "Communications are easier soldier to soldier." But he took issue with his Warsaw Pact counterpart on the subject of modernisation and read out a lengthy list of points he would put to him if they were holding formal talks.

This included the removal of forward base supplies, the reduction of the overall "blitz" capability of both sides, the slowing down of armaments production and a timetable for cuts in tanks.

But his prime concern was the modernisation of Lance. He contradicted Gen Lushev's earlier statement and claimed the Soviets had modernised all their missiles over the past 10 years giving them greater range and accuracy.

"Honestly and frankly, my view is they have modernised over the last decade and it is almost complete," he said. "They now seem to be saying good, cut, stop modernisation, while we have not modernised the one ground-based tactical missile system we have and that is Lance."

But he praised Gen Lushev's decision to come to the West for the first time for their meeting which had been not just significant but "possibly even historic".

This is a U.S. Government publication. Its contents in no way represent the policies, views, or attitudes of the U.S. Government. Users of this publication may cite FBIS or JPRS provided they do so in a manner clearly identifying them as the secondary source.

Foreign Broadcast Information Service (FBIS) and Joint Publications Research Service (JPRS) publications contain political, economic, military, and sociological news, commentary, and other information, as well as scientific and technical data and reports. All information has been obtained from foreign radio and television broadcasts, news agency transmissions, newspapers, books, and periodicals. Items generally are processed from the first or best available source; it should not be inferred that they have been disseminated only in the medium, in the language, or to the area indicated. Items from foreign language sources are translated; those from English-language sources are transcribed, with personal and place names rendered in accordance with FBIS transliteration style.

Headlines, editorial reports, and material enclosed in brackets [] are supplied by FBIS/JPRS. Processing indicators such as [Text] or [Excerpts] in the first line of each item indicate how the information was processed from the original. Unfamiliar names rendered phonetically are enclosed in parentheses. Words or names preceded by a question mark and enclosed in parentheses were not clear from the original source but have been supplied as appropriate to the context. Other unattributed parenthetical notes within the body of an item originate with the source. Times within items are as given by the source. Passages in boldface or italics are as published.

SUBSCRIPTION/PROCUREMENT INFORMATION

The FBIS DAILY REPORT contains current news and information and is published Monday through Friday in eight volumes: China, East Europe, Soviet Union, East Asia, Near East & South Asia, Sub-Saharan Africa, Latin America, and West Europe. Supplements to the DAILY REPORTS may also be available periodically and will be distributed to regular DAILY REPORT subscribers. JPRS publications, which include approximately 50 regional, worldwide, and topical reports, generally contain less time-sensitive information and are published periodically.

Current DAILY REPORTS and JPRS publications are listed in *Government Reports Announcements* issued semimonthly by the National Technical Information Service (NTIS), 5285 Port Royal Road, Springfield, Virginia 22161 and the *Monthly Catalog of U.S. Government Publications* issued by the Superintendent of Documents, U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C. 20402.

The public may subscribe to either hardcover or microfiche versions of the DAILY REPORTS and JPRS publications through NTIS at the above address or by calling (703) 487-4630. Subscription rates will be

provided by NTIS upon request. Subscriptions are available outside the United States from NTIS or appointed foreign dealers. New subscribers should expect a 30-day delay in receipt of the first issue.

U.S. Government offices may obtain subscriptions to the DAILY REPORTS or JPRS publications (hardcover or microfiche) at no charge through their sponsoring organizations. For additional information or assistance, call FBIS, (202) 338-6735, or write to P.O. Box 2604, Washington, D.C. 20013. Department of Defense consumers are required to submit requests through appropriate command validation channels to DIA, RTS-2C, Washington, D.C. 20301. (Telephone: (202) 373-3771, Autovon: 243-3771.)

Back issues or single copies of the DAILY REPORTS and JPRS publications are not available. Both the DAILY REPORTS and the JPRS publications are on file for public reference at the Library of Congress and at many Federal Depository Libraries. Reference copies may also be seen at many public and university libraries throughout the United States.

END OF

FICHE

DATE FILMED

14 JUNE 89